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## Executive Summary

In accordance with Massachusetts state law, the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) contracted with the American Institutes for Research® (AIR®) to conduct a comprehensive review of Frontier Regional and Union 38 (hereafter, FRSU38, the districts) in March 2025. Data collection activities associated with the review included interviews, focus groups, and document reviews, and were designed to understand how districts operate in support of continuous improvement efforts. The review focused on the six standards (and related indicators) that DESE has identified as being important components of district effectiveness. The resulting report provides an in-depth look at district systems, policies, and practices and includes recommendations to promote systemic improvements and advance equitable student outcomes and experiences.

In addition, to collect data on instructional practices, two observers, who focused primarily on instruction in the classroom, visited FRSU38 (including all five schools: Conway Grammar, Deerfield Elementary, Sunderland Elementary, Whately Elementary, and Frontier Regional, a middle and high school) during the week of March 3, 2025. The observers conducted 63 observations in a sample of classrooms across grade levels, focused primarily on literacy, English language arts (ELA), and mathematics. The Teachstone Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS) protocol, developed by the Center for Advanced Study of Teaching and Learning at the University of Virginia,[[1]](#footnote-2) guided all classroom observations in the districts. These observations used the three grade-band levels of the CLASS protocols: K-3, Upper Elementary (4-5), and Secondary (6‑12).

### [Leadership and Governance](#_Leadership_and_Governance)

Darius Modestow, the superintendent of FRSU38, oversees five schools and collaborates with four towns and five school committees. With a leadership team and administrative team, the districts support teaming structures within schools and across the constituent communities that advance school priorities. In addition, strong working relationships exist between elected officials, central office leaders, and school leaders.

The districts are in the process of updating their strategic plan, and all schools have a School Improvement Plan (SIP). Yet the plans lack consistency with regard to identifying specific measures of success and processes for progress monitoring at both the school and central office levels. As a result, the ability to make more concrete updates of progress to school committees is limited. Despite the strong working relationships, multiple focus group participants described the burdens of working across four towns and five school committees and expressed concerns about what would happen if the current superintendent or other key central office leaders were to leave their positions. Their concerns highlight the importance of developing a sustainability plan for leadership by planning for recruiting and retaining leaders. Regarding stakeholder engagement, although central office leaders have made efforts to engage parents, including hosting meetings in all four towns, acting upon parental feedback remains an area for growth.

### [Curriculum and Instruction](#_Curriculum_and_Instruction)

FRSU38 have two directors of education who oversee curriculum and instruction. At the elementary level, there is a structured process for curricular review and selection that involves multiple participants at the school and central office levels. Recently, FRSU38 selected and implemented new ELA and mathematics curricula in the four elementary schools. FRSU38 leaders and educators reported that there are consistent instructional models in the new curricula that involve high levels of student input and student voice. The curricula and instructional models are implemented with fidelity. Across all schools in FRSU38, school leaders reported that there are several academic interventions available to support students in accessing Tier 1 instruction. In addition, the variety of coursework and electives allows students to engage in rigorous coursework and courses that align with their interests. Educators in FRSU38 reported that the districts are committed to equity and having diverse representation in academic content.

Whereas elementary ELA and mathematics have consistent instructional models, leaders have not communicated and implemented a specific instructional vision across schools. In addition, at Frontier Regional School, teachers develop their own curricula; relatedly, there is no curriculum review and selection process, no high-quality instructional materials (HQIM) are implemented, and curricula are not vertically and horizontally aligned. Additionally, the lack of expectations for instructional models and practices at the secondary level creates inconsistent student experiences.

### [Assessment](#_Assessment)

FRSU38 use a variety of data, including both academic and nonacademic information, for each student. At the elementary level, FRSU38 have common assessments in mathematics and ELA. However, at the secondary level, there are no expectations for common assessments, which leads to variations among teachers and students not having common experiences from class to class. Data are used across FRSU38 to inform district- and school-level decision making. In addition, to support data access and literacy, FRSU38 recently invested in a data platform for all leaders and educators. At the elementary level, school leaders and teachers described consistent grading practices, but at the secondary level, there is not a transparent and accessible grading system or common rubrics calibrated horizontally and vertically across departments and content areas. Additionally, consistent expectations for sharing information with students and parents on students’ academic progress have yet to be established.

### [Human Resources and Professional Development](#_Human_Resources_and)

Although FRSU38 do not have a dedicated human resources department, several staff, including the superintendent, the director of business administration, and a payroll specialist, divide responsibilities for maintaining employee records, controlling positions, posting vacancies, and supporting school leaders in human resources policies and procedures. With regard to educator evaluations, a review of evaluation records indicates that the districts’ evaluation process is effective at highlighting the strengths of teachers. However, providing consistent feedback for administrators and completing all components of each evaluation in full are areas for growth. Teachers across the districts have regular collaboration time, and FRSU38 is committed to developing schedules for all teachers, including smaller elementary schools where teachers are the lone staff at their grade level, to be able to collaborate with peers. The districts also provide new educators with the resources to be successful; their mentorship program is structured and effective.

Because Frontier Regional School staff are employees of the regional school district, and staff at the elementary schools are employees of their respective towns, navigating human resources between the central office and the towns for staff in the districts is complicated. Staff reported a need to develop simplified human resources protocols and to communicate these procedures to staff. With regard to hiring and onboarding, implementing strategies to recruit a more diverse workforce that is representative of the student body and providing more robust professional support for instructional assistants (IAs), including professional development and onboarding for those who start after the first day of school, are areas for growth.

### [Student Support](#_Student_Support)

In FRSU38, the two directors of education and the director of student services oversee student supports and have helped all schools to have teams that assess student needs, assign interventions, and support communication among staff. FRSU38 have an established safe and supportive climate for their staff and students. Students have meaningful opportunities to provide feedback and exercise leadership in the elementary and secondary levels. FRSU38 have robust tiered mental and behavioral health services that support most students’ mental and emotional well-being. The districts have provided guidance to all schools on the common characteristics of effective multitiered systems of support (MTSS) and training for school leaders on implementing MTSS. In addition, FRSU38 have done work on creating a uniform MTSS.

Although there is some communication sent to families, families voiced concerns that communication is inconsistent across schools and that content often lacks substance or important issues that students are experiencing. FRSU38 do not have guidance or expectations on family communication to make sure that families are receiving regular updates.

### [Financial and Asset Management](#_Financial_and_Asset)

Respondents appreciate FRSU38 central office leaders for their competence in supporting the financial and asset management of five districts, including Frontier Regional School (serving four towns), and four elementary districts (each in a different town). All parties play a role in maintaining positive relations between the FRSU38 central office and the four municipalities. The budget development process is thorough, involving multiple stages of review and feedback from principals, school committee members, and town officials. In addition, FRSU38 provides access to technology with a Chromebook for each student, along with comprehensive support for remote learning. Finally, the central office uses its capacity to support independent towns in tracking capital needs in school buildings.

Along with the districts’ positive attributes, there are several opportunities for improvement. The financial management of five entities is complicated, and the separate districts sometimes function as a cohesive fiscal unit and sometimes face challenges operating as separate entities that lack sufficient coordination. For example, a challenge that the central office faces is paying vendors when more than one district is involved. Similarly, the districts face challenges in how special education is organized across the municipalities. In addition, the lack of alignment among the respective towns in the final stages of the budget approval process leads to uncertainty for towns and the districts’ leadership. In terms of the budget process, the districts do not currently post budget documents and the stages of the budget process to websites.

## Frontier Regional and Union 38: District Review Overview

### Purpose

Conducted under Chapter 15, Section 55A of the Massachusetts General Laws, comprehensive district reviews support local school districts in establishing or strengthening a cycle of continuous improvement. Reviews carefully consider the effectiveness of systemwide functions, referring to the six district standards used by DESE: Leadership and Governance, Curriculum and Instruction, Assessment, Human Resources and Professional Development, Student Support, and Financial and Asset Management.[[2]](#footnote-3) Reviews provide the state, district leaders, and the public with an in-depth look into the systems, structures, and practices of a district and how they affect student experiences and opportunities. District reviews provide information and recommendations to support districts in implementing systemic improvements and advance equitable student outcomes and experiences.

### Methodology

A district review team consisting of AIR staff members and subcontractors, with expertise in each district standard, reviews documentation and extant data prior to conducting an on-site visit. On-site data collection includes team members conducting interviews and focus group sessions with a wide range of stakeholders, including municipal staff, school committee members, teachers’ association representatives, district and school administrators, teachers, students, and students’ families. Reviewers also conduct focus groups and virtual interviews as needed. Information about review activities and the site visit schedule is in Appendix A. Team members also observe classroom instruction and collect data using the CLASS protocol. The Districtwide Instructional Observation Report resulting from these classroom observations is in Appendix B.

Following the site visit, all interview and focus group data are transcribed using automated transcription. The transcripts are then coded using both deterministic coding, based on the protocol questions, and natural language processing models. Team members analyze the coded data to develop a set of objective findings. The team lead and multiple quality assurance reviewers, including DESE staff, then review the initial draft of the report. DESE staff provide recommendations for the districts, based on the findings of strengths and areas for growth identified, before AIR finalizes and submits the report to DESE. DESE previews and then sends the report to the districts for factual review before publishing it on the DESE website. DESE also provides additional resources to support implementation of DESE’s District Standards and Indicators, summarized in Appendix C.

### Site Visit

The site visit to the districts and schools of FRSU38 was conducted during the week of March 3, 2025. The site visit included 26 hours of interviews and focus groups with approximately 73 stakeholders, including regional and district school committee members from the regional school and three of four towns, central office administrators, school staff, students, students’ families, and teachers’ association representatives. The review team conducted six teacher focus groups with 22 elementary school teachers, five middle school teachers, and three high school teachers; two focus groups with four middle school and six high school students; and one family focus group with four parents. Data collection also included distributing a questionnaire to district leaders, as well as to each principal, to gather information about district and school processes and operations; respondents in FRSU38 completed the district questionnaire and five of five principal questionnaires.

The site team also conducted 63 observations of classroom instruction in all five schools. Certified team members conducted instructional observations using the Teachstone CLASS protocol.

### District Profile

FRSU38 consist of five districts that share a superintendent, four of which make up a superintendency union. The districts enroll students primarily from four towns in Western Massachusetts: Conway, Deerfield, Sunderland, and Whately. The superintendency union consists of four elementary schools from the four towns, each of which constitutes a district with its own school committee; these committees and towns have formed a fifth district, which supports Frontier, the regional middle and high school, located in Deerfield. FRSU38 collaborating as a group of districts allows them to pool resources to form a central office and hire a common superintendent. The four towns’ elementary schools—Conway Grammar, Deerfield Elementary, Sunderland Elementary, and Whately Elementary—each serve Grades K-6; Frontier Regional serves students in Grades 7-12 from all four member towns. Frontier Regional School and all of the elementary schools also enroll students from surrounding towns through school choice.

The districts are located in western Massachusetts between the larger communities of Greenfield and Amherst. The population and median income from 2019 to 2023 (depending on when each community was surveyed) for each of the towns according to census data are as follows:

* Deerfield: population = 5,176 residents; median income = $103,110
* Whately: population = 1,607 residents; median income = $102,734
* Conway: population = 1,761 residents, median income = $92,471
* Sunderland: population = 3,663 residents; median income = $61,442

Deerfield’s and Whately’s median income is above the state median income of $101,341, whereas Conway and Sunderland were below, based on 2023 data from the Census Bureau.

The superintendent of FRSU38 is Darius Modestow, who was appointed in 2019. Frontier is governed by a school committee of 11 members, who all sit on one of the school committees of the four constituent towns. Five-member school committees separately govern Conway, Deerfield, and Sunderland, and a three-member school committee governs Whately. Members are elected to their town school committees for three-year terms and can represent their town committee on the regional committee for one year.

In the 2024-2025 school year, the districts served 1,348 students across five schools from four towns. Since the 2021-2022 school year, total enrollment has decreased slightly; there were 610 students in 2021-2022 and 588 students in the current year at Frontier Regional School, for example. Table 1 provides an overview of student enrollment by school for the 2024-2025 school year.

Table 1. Schools, Type, Grades Served, and Enrollment, 2024-2025

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| School | Type | Grades Served | Enrollment |
| Conway Grammar | Elementary | K-6 | 152 |
| Deerfield Elementary | Elementary | K-6 | 301 |
| Sunderland Elementary | Elementary | K-6 | 174 |
| Whately Elementary | Elementary | K-6 | 133 |
| Frontier Regional | Middle/High | 7-12 | 588 |
|  |  | **FRSU38 total** | **1,348** |

Figure 1 shows the distribution of FRSU38’s students by race/ethnicity. Figure 2 shows student makeup for selected populations compared with state averages. Full enrollment figures compared with the state are in Tables D1a-D1e and D2a-D2e in Appendix D. Appendix D also provides additional information about district enrollment, student attendance, and expenditures.

Figure 1. Distribution of Students, by Race/Ethnicity (2024-2025)

Figure 2. Distribution of Students, by Selected Populations (2024-2025)

Figure 3 shows the percentage of FRSU38’s students meeting or exceeding expectations on the Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS), compared with the statewide percentage of students meeting or exceeding expectations on MCAS. In 2024, the percentage of students meeting or exceeding expectations was higher or the same for Conway, Sunderland, and Whately compared with the state in Grades 3-8 (ELA). The percentage of students meeting or exceeding expectations was higher for Conway, Deerfield, Sunderland, and Frontier than for the state by 1 percentage point to 16 percentage points in Grades 3-8 and 10 (mathematics). Finally, the percentage of students meeting or exceeding expectations was higher or the same across all schools in FRSU38 compared with the state in Grades 5, 8, and 10 (science).

Figure 3a. Percentage of Students Meeting or Exceeding Expectations, MCAS, 2024

Figure 3b. Percentage of Students Meeting or Exceeding Expectations, MCAS, 2024

Figure 3c. Percentage of Students Meeting or Exceeding Expectations, MCAS, 2024

Figure 4 shows the percentage of FRSU38’s High Needs students meeting or exceeding expectations on the Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS), compared with the statewide percentage of High Needs students meeting or exceeding expectations on MCAS. FRSU38’s High Needs students compose 38.2 percent of the districts. The percentage of High Needs students meeting or exceeding expectations on the 2024 MCAS assessments was higher for Conway, Sunderland, and Whately by 2 percentage points to 28 percentage points than for the state in Grades 3-8 (ELA and mathematics). The percentage of High Needs students meeting or exceeding expectations was higher for Conway and Deerfield by 6 percentage points to 34 percentage points than for the state in Grades 5 and 8 (science). High Needs students in Frontier scored 5 percentage points to 16 percentage points below the state average for Grades 3-8 (ELA and mathematics), 5 and 8 (science), and 10 (ELA, mathematics, and science).

Figure 4a. Percentage of High Needs Students Meeting or Exceeding Expectations, MCAS, 2024

Figure 4b. Percentage of High Needs Students Meeting or Exceeding Expectations, MCAS, 2024

Figure 4c. Percentage of High Needs Students Meeting or Exceeding Expectations, MCAS, 2024

In fiscal year 2023, the total in-district per-pupil expenditure for Frontier was $21,445, $3,671 more than districts with similar demographics ($17,774); for Conway was $27,651, $7,261 more than similar districts ($20,390); for Deerfield was $21,439, $3,493 more than similar districts ($17,946); for Sunderland was $26,335, $1,317 less than similar districts ($27,652); and for Whately was $22,812, $4,074 more than similar districts ($18,738).[[3]](#footnote-4) Total in-district per-pupil expenditures in fiscal year 2023, compared with districts of similar wealth, were $1,515 more in Frontier ($19,930), $5,245 more in Conway ($22,406), $1,123 less in Deerfield ($22,562), $3,798 less in Sunderland ($22,537), and $705 more in Whately ($22,107). In-district per-pupil expenditures, compared with the average state spending per pupil of $21,256, were $189 more for Frontier, $6,395 more for Conway, $183 more for Deerfield, $5,079 more for Sunderland, and $1,556 more for Whately. Actual net school spending was greater than what is required by the Chapter 70 state education aid program, as shown in Table D5 in Appendix D.

### Classroom Observations

Two observers, who focused primarily on instruction in the classroom, visited all five schools in FRSU38 during the week of March 3, 2025. The observers conducted 63 observations in a sample of classrooms across grade levels, focused on literacy, ELA, and mathematics (but also included other core academic classes). The CLASS protocol guided all classroom observations in the districts. These observations used the three grade-band levels of CLASS protocols: K-3, Upper Elementary (4-5), and Secondary (6-12).

The K-3 protocol includes 10 classroom dimensions related to three domains: Emotional Support, Classroom Organization, and Instructional Support. The Upper Elementary and Secondary protocols include 11 classroom dimensions related to three domains: Emotional Support, Classroom Organization, and Instructional Support, in addition to Student Engagement. The three domains observed at all levels broadly are defined as follows:

* **Emotional Support.** Describes the social-emotional functioning of the classroom, including teacher-student relationships and responsiveness to social-emotional needs.
* Classroom Organization. Describes the management of students’ behavior, time, and attention in the classroom.
* Instructional Support. Describes the efforts to support cognitive and language development, including cognitive demand of the assigned tasks, the focus on higher-order thinking skills, and the use of process-oriented feedback.

When conducting a classroom visit, the observer rates each dimension (including Student Engagement) on a scale from 1 to 7. A rating of 1 or 2 (low range) indicates that the dimension was never or rarely evident during the visit. A rating of 3, 4, or 5 (middle range) indicates that the dimension was evident but not exhibited consistently or in a way that included all students. A rating of 6 or 7 (high range) indicates that the dimension was reflected in all or most classroom activities and in a way that included all or most students.

In FRSU38, ratings are provided across three grade bands: K-5, 6-8, and 9-12. For each grade band, ratings are provided across the overarching domains as well as at individual dimensions within those domains. Figure 5 shows average ratings, by domain, for each grade band. The full report of findings from observations conducted in FRSU38 is in Appendix B, and summary results are in Tables 17, 18, and 19 in this appendix.

Figure 5. CLASS Domain Averages by Grade Band

Overall, across all grade bands, instructional observations suggest mixed emotional support, high classroom organization and student engagement (Grades 4 and up), and mixed evidence of consistently rigorous instructional support.

## Leadership and Governance

This section examines the extent to which school committees, district leaders, central office leaders, school leaders, and advisory council members work collaboratively and strategically to promote high-quality teaching and learning that is antiracist, inclusive, multilingual, and multicultural; that values and affirms each student and their families; and that creates equitable opportunities and experiences for all students, particularly those who have been historically underserved. It also focuses on the extent to which districts (in this case, a group of districts that partially function as a single entity) establish, implement, and evaluate policies, plans, procedures, systems, and budgets with a primary focus on achieving districtwide strategic objectives, in part through equitable and effective use of resources, that ultimately lead to high-quality teaching and learning for all students.

Table 2 summarizes key strengths and areas for growth in leadership and governance in FRSU38.

Table 2. Summary of Key Strengths and Areas for Growth: Leadership and Governance Standard

| Indicator | Strengths | Areas for growth |
| --- | --- | --- |
| [Leadership and Governing Structures](#_Leadership_and_Governing) | * The districts support teaming structures within schools and across FRSU38 that advance school priorities. |  |
| [Strategic Planning, Implementation, and Monitoring](#_Strategic_Planning,_Implementation,) |  | * Identifying specific measures of success and processes for progress monitoring embedded within all strategic plans at the school and districts’ levels * Having formal processes in place to regularly communicate progress toward the districts’ strategic goals |
| [District Culture](#_District_Culture) | * Strong working relationships exist between elected officials, central office leaders, and school leaders. | * Identifying specific strategies for recruiting and retaining leaders * Communicating about and incorporating parental feedback into areas of operations |

### Leadership and Governing Structures

Darius Modestow is the superintendent of FRSU38. The superintendent and central office oversee five schools, report to five school committees, and work with officials from four towns (Conway, Deerfield, Sunderland, and Whately). Although FRSU38 are a collection of five districts, including a superintendency union and a regional school, as well as four towns, central office staff reported that they think of themselves as a “school district,” implying that they attempt to operate as a single entity.

According to the *Frontier Regional and Union #38 School Districts Policy Manual*, four of the 11 members of the Frontier school committee are appointed by the four local school committees and seven are elected directly through annual town elections. The four towns’ local school committees oversee the operations and policies of the single elementary schools within each of their respective towns. All five school committees meet as a joint committee twice a year. A review of the five school committees’ websites revealed that meeting schedules, agendas, materials, minutes, and recordings of their meetings are publicly available.

The superintendent and central office staff collaborate with the Frontier school committee and individual committees from four towns: Conway, Deerfield, Sunderland, and Whately. School committee members and the superintendent characterized their working relationships as positive and productive. Interviews with school committee members indicated that the school committees focus primarily on budget and policy for their local elementary schools as well as their town contribution to the regional school’s budget. Interviewed school committee members and town officials from the four constituent communities, as well as the superintendent, voiced appreciation for their productive working relationships. One school committee member stated, “I consider us very fortunate that we have a great working relationship between the various school committees and the superintendent and [central office] administration.” Similarly, the superintendent praised the school committee members, explaining that they understand the importance of collaboration concerning important policy and financial questions.

Despite the strong relationships between school committee members and the superintendent, multiple focus group participants, including school committee members, municipal officials, central office leaders, and teachers, highlighted concerns about the challenges of leading the collection of districts, particularly the demands on the superintendent. Multiple interview participants emphasized the level of effort involved in the superintendent’s job of leading a group of districts comprising multiple independent entities, each with their own budgets, elections, constituencies, and labor union contracts. Within the districts, the superintendent works with 24 school committee members (across five school committees) monthly, as well as with finance committees and select board members in four towns during budget season. The superintendent and business manager reported that they both regularly attend nine to 15 night meetings per month. School committee members noted that the superintendent is responsive to communication but that they also were aware that the volume of people who might be asking questions or offering input can be quite high at any one time, including school committee members and other officials in the four constituent communities in FRSU38.

The school committees regularly conduct performance reviews of the superintendent. According to interviews with school committee members, the chairs of the respective school committees work together to administer an online survey to all school committee members. The form asks members to rate the superintendent across four standards (instructional leadership, management and operations, family and community engagement, and professional culture), and the chairs compile and then present the data at a joint school committee meeting. Interview and focus group respondents reported that not all school committee members have completed the evaluation form in recent years but that participation has improved in the last year. The agenda for the joint meeting on April 3, 2024 indicated that the members voted on the superintendent’s evaluation as recently as the spring of 2024, approximately 11 months before the onsite visit. A copy of the superintendent’s most recent evaluation indicated that 20 of the 24 school committee members (80 percent) participated in the online survey.

Beyond improving participation in the evaluation process, clarifying oversight within the districts is a recent focus of the superintendent and the school committees. When the superintendent was hired, the five school committees lacked a process to either hire or fire a superintendent if the school committees disagreed. They relied, according to the superintendent, on a vague definition of “consensus.” In the year that in-person classes resumed after the COVID-19 pandemic, the superintendent and school committee members wrote a policy and an accompanying procedure to address this issue of superintendent evaluation and termination, should the need arise. Despite this clarified procedure, the superintendent described the oversight being exercised by such a large group of people as difficult because of his limited contact with some of the many elected officials.

Multiple interview and focus group respondents reported that the superintendent takes the lead in contract negotiations and collective bargaining. The superintendent described negotiating with four different towns and school committees as highly complex. He noted that it would be otherwise prohibitively difficult to adequately brief all parties on education association contracts, and thus allow all representatives to more fully participate in negotiations. Two different collective bargaining agreements (CBAs) govern Frontier school employees, whereas Union 38 has two distinct CBAs, totaling four CBAs across FRSU38. The Frontier school committee has a negotiating subcommittee, which includes the superintendent, the director of business administration, a school committee member from each committee, and a town representative for each town; the superintendent leads negotiations. One school member who is part of the subcommittee described being very involved in negotiations, which were occurring at the time of the district review in March 2025, but also reported the superintendent’s prominent role. Interview respondents indicated that the elementary school districts bargain at the individual town level with their respective school committees; the superintendent also plays a key role in these negotiations. The four elementary schools typically establish a single, common CBA (see the Human Resources and Professional Development section). One challenge in negotiations is that, according to multiple focus group participants, the four towns have different needs, outlooks, and abilities to pay staff.

A leadership team that consists of key central office roles, including two directors of education (elementary and secondary), a director of business administration, a director of student services, and five school principals, supports the superintendent. This team meets twice a month, focusing on strategic planning, resource allocation, staffing, program implementation, and operations. In addition, a separate administrative team, which includes the leadership team plus assistant principals, the director of early childhood, director of food services, director of instructional technology, director of school facilities, and the school nurse leader, meets monthly. According to meeting agendas, administrative team meetings focus on a range of issues, including handbook revisions, performance evaluation, classroom visits, different trainings, and other topics. At the central office, the director of student services is responsible for maintaining compliance with the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act and overseeing special education needs. The directors of education manage English Learner needs across schools and oversee health and wellness programs in the districts.

The central office supports school leaders with staffing, budgeting, and scheduling. School leaders reported that the central office supports scheduling by providing a recommended number of minutes per day that each classroom should devote to ELA and mathematics, and then the principals create the schedules for their schools, yet the number of staff depends on the individual school’s budget.

With the exception of Frontier Regional School, which has an administrative leadership team, all schools have a school instructional leadership team (ILT) that meets either monthly or bimonthly, depending on the school. School leaders noted that the level of autonomy granted to ILTs enhances their effectiveness in implementing school initiatives aligned with FRSU38’s overall educational vision and strategic goals. They described “common themes” that are part of all schools’ leadership team meetings, while also having the ability to “prioritize individual initiatives within each school.” The school leaders meet monthly, and a review of agendas of monthly principals’ meetings in 2023-2024 indicated that the focus of these meetings included updates on the equity audit, curricular implementation goals and updates, Student Opportunity Act updates, professional development, and other trainings and scheduling items. The frequency with which individual school leaders reported meeting with central office staff varied from weekly to only as needed (no regular schedule). The focus of these meetings also varied by school and included reviewing student data and/or student work aligned to the common priorities; co-observing classrooms; planning, attending, and debriefing ILT meetings; planning/revising the school improvement strategy; and working with teachers to implement new curricula. The districts support teaming structures within schools and across FRSU38 that advance school priorities, which is a strength of the districts.

In the districts’ efforts to engage family and community members, central office leaders reported supporting or convening a Special Education Parent Advisory Council (SEPAC), parent teacher organizations, and school councils across FRSU38. The four towns share a SEPAC, and according to a flyer, they hold monthly public virtual meetings, which are followed by a private caregiver chat session. Two school leaders reported having an English Learner Parent Advisory Council, although it is not legally required on the basis of the district’s percentage of English Learners. Central office staff reported that all five schools have school councils; councils meet either monthly or quarterly depending on the school.

### Strategic Planning, Implementation, and Monitoring

The mission of FRSU38 is “building dynamic learning communities, one student, one teacher, one family at a time,” and their vision is to be “vibrant, collaborative, engaging, and inclusive learning communities promoting the growth of every student,” according to central office leaders. Similarly, central office and school leaders also reported during interviews and focus groups being focused on creating an aligned curricular vision. Multiple teacher focus group participants reported either common instructional visions or departmental visions, although not always larger schoolwide visions.

The superintendent reported that FRSU38’s current strategic plan is a product of “running off the draft” of the initial entry plan and that he and the school committees agree that it is time to “rebuild” that plan. He confirmed that the districts are currently in the planning process, which started with seeking information from parents and community members through surveys, in-person “meet and greets,” and virtual coffee meetings, emphasizing the importance of collecting information from the public to help define their priorities. This information-gathering process included all four communities. Following the gathering of information from the public, staff from the central office were currently working on developing a strategic plan as a leadership group at the time of the visit, before presenting to school committees. At the time of the onsite, the districts were also in the process of creating a “portrait of a graduate,” concurrent with the strategic plan. Furthermore, the districts have an equity plan, and these principles are central to their strategic plan. The equity plan grew out of a community committee, which began during the COVID-19 pandemic, which led to an equity audit completed through an outside organization 18 months prior to the on-site visit. The key components of the “Frontier Regional School District Equity Plan”, include professional development, curriculum and assessment management, monitoring and evaluation, and community engagement; these principles are incorporated in the FRSU38 strategic plan.

FRSU38’s current strategic plan identifies four priorities:

* to establish clear and valid objectives for students;
* to ensure internal consistency and equity for students in program development and implementation;
* to “establish structures for examining student, school, and district data to adjust, improve, or terminate ineffective practices or programs”; and
* to maintain “policies and procedures . . . to establish direction for the [districts].”

For each priority, the plan includes strategies, action steps, a timeline, the person or team responsible, and plans for monitoring implementation or effectiveness for some objectives.

The existing strategic plan for FRSU38 includes some measures to monitor the implementation and efficacy of the action steps associated with each of the four listed objectives, and each objective has one to three strategies. The majority of action steps within the strategies are measures of implementation and are not measures of effectiveness. For instance, for Objective 1, “establish clear and valid objectives for students,” the strategy is to “ensure vertical alignment.” The first action step is “identify and interpret priority standards at each grade level across subject areas,” and the monitoring of implementation and effectiveness states that they will determine “seven to 15 priority standards established at grade level and/or department levels,” and these priority standards will be reflected in the curriculum maps. However, the strategic plan does not include measures that indicate when vertical alignment has been achieved. Similarly, under Objective 4, governance and control, one of FRSU38’s strategies is to “communicate effectively with stakeholders.” None of the four action steps indicate measures of effectiveness.

At the school level, all schools have developed SIPs that include instructional priorities and strategies for reducing disparities in student opportunities and outcomes. In focus groups, school leaders explained that the strategic plan for the districts guided the development of their individual SIPs and that because they helped to develop the strategic plan, there is strong buy-in to the plan. However, a review of the five SIPs revealed that although most aspects of these plans align, not all priorities or metrics for these priorities within the SIPs explicitly align with FRSU38’s strategic plan. In addition, three of the SIPs lack specific metrics of success or strategies for progress monitoring. As an example, one SIP includes “curriculum format and modifications” as an action step. The notes for 2024-2025 are to “continue data meetings with departments to identify areas of focus [and] PLC [professional learning community] meetings for departments to analyze data and student work.” Identifying specific measures of success and processes for progress monitoring embedded within all strategic plans at the school and central office levels is an area for growth.

In terms of sharing progress toward goals with school committees, school committee members reported occasional updates from their individual schools and an annual update on MCAS results. A school committee member stated that they do not get regular updates on test scores, absences, benchmark data, survey data, or other measures. A review of school committee agendas is consistent with reports of updates shared in focus groups. More specific measures, as described in the preceding paragraph, may help FRSU38 create more tangible benchmarks to share with school committees. Having formal processes in place to regularly communicate progress on the districts’ strategic goals is an area for growth.

### District Culture

School committee members, municipal officials from the four constituent communities, central office leaders, and school leaders maintain strong working relationships with each other, which enables their ability to advance FRSU38’s strategic objectives and improvement plans. School committee members reported soliciting views from people in their communities, including individuals with and without children in the school system. For example, one school committee member offered an example of how the school committees recognized the importance of keeping the SEPAC better informed about their work. As a result, the school committees voted that all meeting agendas and materials be sent to the SEPAC, and the SEPAC can request to be part of any public discussion. In addition, central office–level focus group participants reported engaging the community through a series of meetings regarding ideas about how to improve student attendance (see the Student Support section). Town officials reported working together as a group to support the schools. One municipal official described the relationship between their town and the districts’ central office leadership as “excellent.” Another official said that the relationship is “the best it has been in a very, very long time,” attributing the positive relationship to the collaborative nature of central office leaders and the trust that these staff, particularly the superintendent, have built between the central office and the town officials. Similarly, a school committee member stated, “I consider us very fortunate that we have a great working relationship between the various school committees and the superintendent and administration.” Likewise, the superintendent attributed the success of the schools to having school committees that support their work. Strong working relationships among elected officials, central office leaders, and school leaders are a strength of the districts.

Central office leaders and teachers generally agree that there are positive relationships between the districts’ central office leadership and their two main teacher unions. However, multiple people noted that tensions can increase during negotiating periods, which were taking place at the time of the visit in January 2025. The superintendent and the FRS teachers' association do not have regular check-ins, according to interviews. In contrast, the superintendent reported meeting with the Union 38 School Districts unit approximately every other month and also scheduling quick Zoom check-ins, as needed. Teacher representatives from both associations described the relationship between the two unions and central office as “pretty straightforward” and “very good” and that they are able to work together to resolve any issues through the structures defined in the contracts. Teacher representatives reported that central office leaders are responsive to their feedback to “the best of their ability.” They reported creating memoranda of understanding (MOUs) outside of bargaining years to address “tricky situations.” For example, respondents indicated that the district office helped the local teacher association's leaders settle an issue clarifying which members with certain administrative roles should be in which bargaining unit. The parties agreed to a change in the middle of a contract. One respondent said, “I think within the confines of the contract, we've been able to address different things.”

With regard to leadership stability for the districts, the burdens of working across four towns and five school committees led several school committee members and municipal officials to express concerns about what would happen if the current superintendent were to leave his position or if other key central office leadership positions were to need to be replaced. The current superintendent has been in the districts for a total of 17 years, having previously been a principal and assistant principal. One town official stated that the number of meetings that the superintendent attends is “just not a sustainable model for somebody to have a life.” Relatedly, one school committee reported that they were less involved than they might otherwise be, because of the superintendent’s limited time and not wanting to add to his burden, stating that “we want to keep him here.” In addition, because FRSU38 does not have dedicated human resources staff, the superintendent, the director of business administration, and payroll share those roles and responsibilities, adding to concerns about stability and sustainability. Central office leaders did not outline any specific strategies for recruiting and retaining leaders, and the lack of such strategies is an area for growth.

Central office leaders agree that FRSU38 value stakeholder engagement and pointed to efforts during the strategic planning process to engage families and community members. Specifically, they sent out a survey, held in-person meetings in all four towns, and held virtual meetings. They sought to understand what changes people would like to see in the districts and their schools. A parent focus group participant agreed that the central office had reached out for input on the strategic plan. Parents also reported that the districts convened public meetings in 2024 to discuss the reasons for low attendance. Although local leaders reported several areas in which they had solicited parent feedback, parent focus group participants reported that they did not believe that their previous feedback offered has led to any changes. Parents spoke about concerns that they have shared about safety, bullying, and attendance, especially at the secondary level. According to parents, school culture and a hostile environment were the most common reasons participants offered to explain low attendance. Yet according to one parent, “that feedback went exactly nowhere.” Another parent described long emails from the superintendent detailing his decision-making process regarding snow days, but a noticeable lack of addressing concerns from some parents around bullying and the other topics raised during the public meetings. Parents described some cases where there was an opportunity for input, but also a feeling of “resignation” due to a lack of follow-up or changes resulting from their input in other cases. Despite efforts to engage community members, communicating about and incorporating parental feedback into areas of operations represents an area for growth for the districts.

### DESE Recommendations

* *The districts should work with school leaders to identify concrete measures of success and develop a system for monitoring progress towards their strategic goals.*
* *The districts should devise a plan for regularly sharing updates about progress toward meeting their strategic goals with their school committees.*
* *The districts should identify strategies for recruiting and retaining district leaders, in order to preserve stability and sustainability of district operations.*
* *The districts should strengthen systems for responding to and incorporating parent feedback by clearly communicating follow-up actions and demonstrating how family input has informed decisions.*

## Curriculum and Instruction

This section examines the extent to which district leaders have established a shared instructional vision, anchored in culturally and linguistically sustaining practices, that guides all curricular and instructional decisions toward equitable outcomes for all students. It also focuses on the extent to which the districts pair high-quality curriculum and instructional materials, and high expectations for all students, with individualized supports so that every student can engage in deeper learning and develop the knowledge and skills that will prepare them to succeed in college and/or the workplace.

Table 3 summarizes key strengths and areas for growth in curriculum and instruction for FRSU38.

Table 3. Summary of Key Strengths and Areas for Growth: Curriculum and Instruction Standard

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Indicator | Strengths | Areas for growth |
| [Instructional Leadership](#_Instructional_Leadership) | * Elementary ELA and mathematics use consistent instructional models. | * Communicating and supporting implementation of a specific instructional vision across all schools. |
| [Curriculum and Instructional Materials](#_Curriculum_and_Instructional) | * There is a structured process for curricular selection and review at the elementary schools that involves multiple school participants. | * Implementing HQIM and establishing curriculum review processes in Grades 7-12 * Aligning curricula vertically and horizontally across all subjects at the secondary level |
| [Equitable Practices and Access](#_Equitable_Practices_and) | * Across schools in FRSU38, several academic interventions are available to support students. * The variety of coursework and electives allows students to engage in rigorous coursework and courses that align with their interests. |  |
| [Effective Instruction and Curricular Implementation](#_Effective_Instruction_and) | * FRSU38’s commitment to equity and diverse representation in academic content. | * Establishing expectations for instructional models and practices at the secondary level to allow for more consistent student experiences |

### Instructional Leadership

Two directors of education are responsible for curriculum and instruction in FRSU38. One curriculum director oversees Grades K-6 and the other oversees Grades 7-12. Central office staff reported that the directors of education help to lead the implementation and monitoring of the instructional vision that focuses on learning environments and growth of all students (see the Leadership and Governance section). They monitor this vision by conducting observations with the administrative team, comprising all of the school administrators and central office leaders. However, according to other central office leaders, school leaders, and teachers, the instructional vision is not guiding instruction across all schools, and some respondents were not able to articulate the instructional vision. For example, the central office staff did not consistently report the same instructional vision, and school leaders reported that instruction aligns at some, but not all, levels and subjects. Communicating and supporting implementation of a specific instructional vision across all schools is an area for growth for FRSU38.

The principals of the five schools regularly meet with the superintendent as part of the administrative team to discuss instruction-related topics that include efforts to create what one principal called a “unifying vision” of curriculum and instruction across schools. Another principal said that this often entailed trying to get “calibrated across the schools with grade-level meetings and pacing recommendations for each subject.” Elementary teachers noted that the new ELA and mathematics curricula have tightly defined instructional models that are implemented with fidelity across all four elementary schools. According to the elementary school teacher focus group participants, the instructional models for both ELA and mathematics involve high levels of student input and student voice. The consistent instructional models used in elementary ELA and mathematics are a strength of FRSU38.

ELA and mathematics curricula are vertically and horizontally aligned across the four elementary schools in U38. Staff reported that, as students transition to the regional middle and high school, there are transitional meetings among elementary teachers from the four K-6 schools and middle school teachers at Frontier Regional School to support the move from Grade 6 to Grade 7 but that instruction was not firmly aligned yet between the elementary and middle school levels. Additionally, although the districts’ central office leaders are not providing specific guidance for how the ILTs should operate, school-level leadership team meetings help to create some additional instructional continuity at the school levels (see the Leadership and Governance section).

### Curriculum and Instructional Materials

FRSU38 began implementing High Quality Instructional Materials (HQIM) in ELA and mathematics in elementary schools during the past two years. The superintendent reported using CURATE,[[4]](#footnote-5) EdReports, and Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS) Design Badge to evaluate curricular decisions.

The districts participated in DESE’s IMplement MA: Evaluate & Select HQIM Network beginning in 2022 and follow the curriculum selection process for elementary curricula. Curriculum selection is a year-long process that begins with FRSU38 forming committees with representatives from each grade level and specialists for each subject. The committee studies, reviews, and evaluates the current curricula and instruction; conducts a needs inventory, which includes feedback from families; creates a vision for the new curriculum, which includes cultural responsiveness; reviews curricula that match the vision; pilots selected curricula; and visits schools already implementing the selected curricula. After they decide on the new curriculum, the districts offer professional development and create an implementation support committee. FRSU38 has established review committees for each content area. FRSU38 has a five-year curriculum review cycle. In the current review cycle, language arts, world language, and English as a second language (ESL) curricula were reviewed in school year 2022-2023; mathematics, physical education, and health curricula were reviewed in school year 2023-2024; science, library, and technology curricula are being reviewed in school year 2024-2025; social studies, art, and music curricula will be reviewed in school year 2025-2026; and school year 2026-2027 will be used to reflect and regroup. Although FRSU38 is currently going through a study of the science curricula, they will not immediately implement a new curriculum because teachers have expressed that adopting two new curricula in back-to-back years was overwhelming and there was a lot of new content to learn. Reports from curriculum leaders and a review of the districts’ curriculum management plan document confirm that there is a structured process for curricular selection and review at the elementary schools that involves multiple school participants, which is a strength of the districts.

According to central office leaders, school leaders, and teachers, curricula at Frontier Regional School are designed by teachers, with the expectation that their curricula align with state standards and that there is collaboration among teachers in a department during development. A single department head oversees one department per content area for Grades 7-12. High school teachers reported that departments develop goals and visions for the courses they are planning to offer, which are reviewed by central office leaders, but school or central office leaders do not review curricula that are developed. Although teachers expressed appreciation for the flexibility they have to create curricula, implementing HQIM and establishing curriculum review processes in Grades 7-12 are an areas for growth for the districts.

Table 4 summarizes the status of all curricula used in FRSU38.

Table 4. Curricula Used in FRSU38

| Grade level(s) | Subject | Curriculum | Type | CURATE rating | EdReports rating |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| K-5 | Mathematics | Bridges in Mathematics | Comprehensive and Supplemental | PME | ME |
| 6 | Mathematics | Illustrative Mathematics | Comprehensive | ME | ME |
| K-2 | ELA | University of Florida Literacy Institute | Supplemental | NR | NR |
| K-6 | ELA | EL Education | Comprehensive | ME | ME |
| K-5 | Science | Mystery Science | Supplemental | NR | NR |
| K-5 | Science | BetterLesson Science | Supplemental | NR | NR |
| K-5 | Science | Amplify Science | Comprehensive | ME | ME |
| 6 | Science | Amplify Science | Comprehensive | PME | ME |
| K-5 | Science | OpenSciEd | Comprehensive | NR | NR |
| 6 | Science | OpenSciEd | Comprehensive | ME | ME |
| 5-6 | History/social studies | Investigating History | Comprehensive | NR | NR |
| K-4 | History/social studies | iCivics | Comprehensive | NR | NR |
| 3-5 | History/social studies | Cornerstones for Civic Engagement | Supplemental | NR | NR |
| K-2 | Digital literacy/computer science | NYC CS4All | Comprehensive | ME | NR |
| 3-5 | Digital literacy/computer science | NYC CS4All | Comprehensive | PME | NR |
| 6 | Digital literacy/computer science | NYC CS4All | Comprehensive | NR | NR |
| 7-12 | Mathematics | Teacher developed | Comprehensive | NR | NR |
| 7-8 | Mathematics | Maneuvering the Middle | Comprehensive | NR | NR |
| 9-12 | Mathematics | Discovering Mathematics: Algebra, Geometry, Advanced Algebra | Supplemental | NR | ME |
| 11-12 | Mathematics | Elementary Statistics | Supplemental | NR | NR |
| 11-12 | Mathematics | *Calculus: Graphical, Numerical, Algebraic* textbook | Supplemental | NR | NR |
| 7-12 | ELA | Teacher developed | Comprehensive | NR | NR |
| 7-12 | Science | Teacher developed | Comprehensive | NR | NR |
| 9-10 | Science | Illinois Biology Storylines | Supplemental | NR | NR |
| 9-12 | Science | OpenSciEd | Supplemental | NR | NR |
| 7-12 | History/social studies | Teacher developed | Comprehensive | NR | NR |

*Note*. ME = meets expectations; NR = not rated; PME = partially meets expectations. OpenSciEd and Investigating History are DESE-developed or informed. FRSU38 uses both the Bridges in Mathematics curriculum and interventions offered by the developer.

FRSU38 recently selected and implemented curricular materials that vertically and horizontally align across Grades K-6 with the goal that all students enter Frontier Regional School with similar background knowledge. Elementary and middle school teachers noted that it is too soon to tell whether the new ELA and mathematics elementary curricula will prepare students to enter middle school at similar places. At Frontier Regional School, there is no expectation that departments engage in alignment work; however, some departments attempt to align the curriculum horizontally and vertically. For example, in ELA, the department has developed a scope and sequence for Grades 7-12 so that there is some alignment. In social studies, if two teachers are teaching two sections of the same class, they will use the same curriculum. Conversely, mathematics and science teachers reported that they design their own curriculum for the students they are teaching that year, and although they align with the state standards, there is not much alignment horizontally or vertically. High school students also reported noticing that teachers are designing their own curricula, which can lead to inconsistent student experiences across classes. Aligning curricula vertically and horizontally across all subjects at the secondary level is an area for growth at FRS.

Although elementary ELA and mathematics curricula align across the schools, elementary teachers did note specific concerns about the ELA curriculum preparing students for writing concepts in the middle school. One teacher stated,

I think part of it is I don’t feel great about the writing portion of the ELA as much as I did before, so I don’t feel like it’s meeting their writing needs as much as it should be. Along those lines, I also don’t really see a lot of joy in writing.

Similarly, a teacher also noted, “For math, I think my concern is that there are some students who need more of a challenge, and it’s not meeting their needs.”

### Equitable Practices and Access

Whereas there is some variation in academic interventions based on school size and structure, central office and school leaders reported that academic interventions are consistently available across FRSU38. Central office leaders reported that there are response-to-intervention groups for ELA and mathematics at the elementary schools, and each elementary school has at least one reading interventionist. Furthermore, the elementary schools offer the following supports in ELA and mathematics:

* Conway Grammar: ELA - ELLA (Tiers 2 and 3), University of Florida Literacy Institute (Tiers 2 and 3); Math – Bridges Intervention Materials (Tiers 2 and 3)
* Deerfield Elementary: ELA - SPIRE (Tier 2), REWARDS (Tier 2), University of Florida Literacy Institute (Tiers 2 and 3), Barton Reading & Spelling System (Tier 3), and small group instruction (Tiers 2 and 3); Math - Bridges Intervention Materials (Tiers 2 and 3), interventionist push-in (Tiers 2 and 3).
* Sunderland Elementary: ELA - Orton-Gillingham (Tier 3): Math - Bridges Intervention Materials (Tiers 2 and 3)
* Whately Elementary: Read Naturally (Tiers 2 and 3), University of Florida Literacy Institute (Tiers 2 and 3), Wilson Reading System (Tier 3), and Lexia; Math - Bridges Intervention Materials (Tiers 2 and 3), TouchMath (Tier 3)

At Frontier Regional School, reading class/Orton-Gillingham (Tier 3), ELA specialized instruction classes (Tier 3), ELA skill classes (Tier 3), mathematics tutoring (Tier 2), targeted skill development (Tier 2), and Title I mathematics (Tier 2) are available to support academic needs. School leaders reported that they use student support team (SST) or data team meetings to review student data and put interventions in place where needed and monitored. Across schools in FRSU38, several academic interventions are available to support students, a strength of the districts.

In addition to the interventions reported by leaders, high school teachers noted that they are doing some work to scaffold curricula at a Tier 1 level. High school teachers and students also discussed the PACE class that is offered to all students and is a time when students can go to teachers for extra help. Middle school students also explained that they are able to access extra academic help with teachers during their free advisory period. In both middle and high school, students also can take a class during the PACE block or during an exploratory block that offers the opportunity to seek out extra academic help. Central office and school leaders and teachers reported that they review data during SST and response-to-intervention meetings to match students with available interventions.

In 2024, DESE’s public school monitoring team issued corrective actions to FRSU38 through the Special Education and Civil Rights Monitoring Report. There were corrective actions concerning procedures to follow when an individualized education program (IEP) team member does not attend the team meeting, issuing a proposed IEP and proposed placement to the parent immediately, and documentation in the IEP stating why removal of a student from the general education classroom at any time is considered critical to the student’s program. As of March 2025, FRSU38 implemented the required corrective actions.

A review of the districts’ current placement structure found that Deerfield Elementary and Conway Grammar have substantially separate programs for Students with Disabilities. According to state data, students in substantially separate placements are mostly educated at Conway Grammar. Staff focus group participants reported that many of these students are out-of-district placements. FRSU38 leaders noted that they work to keep students in inclusive settings as much as possible, and placement in substantially separate program classrooms does not mean that they have no interaction with general education peers:

It’s a mindset in our district to say a student may be in that room over 60 percent of the time . . . but they’re overseen by the same liaison that’s running groups and interventions. So we try not to use the word substantially separate program in this district.

Although the English Learner population is rather small in FRSU38 (less than 5 percent in all schools, which is well below the state average of 13.9 percent), the schools provide English Learners with access to services. Currently, Sunderland has a full-time ESL teacher, and Deerfield and Whately share one ESL teacher, based on the needs of students in the school. School staff at Sunderland also noted that they can hire bilingual tutors, as needed, who can help support curriculum and classroom discussion. A 2024 Tiered Focused Monitoring review included findings concerning services for linguistic minority students, but the districts have since completed their corrective actions and are meeting compliance requirements for English Learner education.

A review of Frontier Regional School’s course catalogue indicated that most students have equitable access to a range of rigorous coursework in Grades 9-12. This coursework includes advanced courses as well as both an Innovation Career Pathways and a Frontier Pathways program that give students real-world experiences, electives, and career and technical education courses. Innovation Career Pathways offered include healthcare and social assistance, and advanced manufacturing and engineering. In addition, Frontier Pathways offered include criminal justice and global studies. The pathways programs were established based on data review and student voice (see the Assessment section). High school teachers and students also reported that the school works to make Advanced Placement (AP) classes more accessible by offering an option for students to take AP classes without having to take the AP exam through a program called AP Explore. Students noted, however, that they are not precluded from taking the exam when participating in the AP Explore option. Additionally, advanced coursework completion rates at FRS improved 5.4 percentage points from 59.4 percent in 2022 to 64,8 percent in 2024 for all students and the percentage of FRS students getting 3 to 5 on AP exam was 16 percentage points higher than the state average—86 percent compared to 70 percent, respectively. High school students also noted that the guidance counselors in their school help to make pathway programs and electives accessible for all students. Middle school teachers and students reported that the school has an exploratory block, which allows students to pursue opportunities in a wide range of electives. Elementary teachers also noted the presence of electives that are accessible for all of their students. For example, at Deerfield Elementary, students can participate in band during the school day. The variety of coursework and electives that allow students to engage in rigorous coursework and courses that align with their interests are a strength of FRSU38.

### Effective Instruction and Curricular Implementation

Central office leaders and teachers from across the districts agree that building safe and supportive learning environments is a priority and the districts provide supports for teachers in developing those learning environments in which all students can engage in academic content. Teachers reported that they actively work to build strong relationships with the students in their school. For example, a high school teacher focus group participant noted,

One of the things that I try to do and emphasize is building relationships with each and every student. . . . And I think that lends itself to safety because, as a consequence of these relationships, I can see when a student might be struggling with something at home or something. . . . And then we have direct access to school psychologists. We have direct access to guidance. We have direct access to nurses, and it all happens very quickly.

High school and middle school students reported that their teachers create safe environments and support both their learning and their well-being, with one student noting,

I think all teachers do care about their students, but some teachers especially really show the example that they really do care about you, and they really do want to make sure you learn, but also they want to make sure you’re just okay as a person, and they really care about you and your well-being.

However, classroom observation scores in the middle to high range for dimensions in the Emotional Support indicate that safe and supportive learning environments are not consistent. The middle range scores for Positive Climate indicate that although there are efforts to create a warm and supportive relationship between teachers and students, these efforts are not consistent across all classrooms. Teacher Sensitivity scores in the middle range further highlight that teachers are sometimes aware of and responsive to student needs, but this awareness and responsiveness are not consistent. Regard for Student Perspectives scores in the low to middle range suggest that teachers are inflexible and rigid at times, and other times, they follow students’ lead and give them some choices and opportunities to follow their interests.

Teachers in focus groups reported that they pair their positive classroom environments with evidence-based instructional practices. According to the individuals interviewed, FRSU38 support these practices by providing professional development on new curriculum or instructional models, but there are no required instructional practices at Frontier Regional School. At Frontier, school leaders and teachers noted that the instructional models are typically decided by departments without direct alignment with the instructional vision of the districts. Staff reported more alignment at the middle school level than the high school. For example, some middle school teachers noted that project-based learning was a model that their department was following, but other teachers noted that the instruction in their department varies from teacher to teacher. In addition, middle and high school student focus group participants expressed variety in instructional styles, dependent on the teacher. For example, in some classes, students primarily take notes, and in other classes, they work in groups or do more hands-on tasks. Students noted more uniformity among teachers’ expectations and asking for explanation. A high school student noted,

Fairly often, teachers are good about asking open-ended questions. For example, if you’re asked a question and you present an answer that the teacher wasn’t thinking about, they’ll usually ask you to explain it to the class or try to, like, explain your thought process.

Classroom observation scores in the middle range for dimensions in the Instructional Support domain suggest that support for implementation of instructional practices is not yet fully effective, confirming students’ reports of variance in instruction. For example, scores for Instructional Learning Formats indicate some efforts to engage students, but these efforts have been inconsistent. Concept Development/Understanding scores show that teachers sometimes facilitate engagement in lessons but often focus on basic facts and skills rather than promoting deeper understanding and higher-order thinking skills. Analysis and Inquiry scores reveal limited opportunities for students to engage in higher-order thinking skills. Quality of Feedback scores suggest that although students receive feedback, it often is perfunctory and not sustained long enough to be effective. Language Modeling scores indicate that conversations in the classroom are limited and do not consistently promote advanced language use. Finally, Instructional Dialogue scores show that meaningful, content-based discussions are occasional and often lack depth. Establishing expectations for instructional models and practices at the secondary level to allow for more consistent student experiences is an area for growth.

School leaders, teachers, and students noted that the schools are working to incorporate diverse perspectives in their classes and curricula. FRSU38’s strategic plan clearly articulates equity and representation as key priorities. Cultural responsiveness was one area included during the curriculum review process for the new ELA and mathematics elementary curricula. A school leader noted that “a piece of our school and program plan relates to global citizenship and really making sure that our kids have an understanding of different cultures, different languages, different backgrounds.” High school student focus group participants expressed that class content incorporates diverse perspectives, with one student noting, “I’m just going to say it’s a pretty overwhelming White school, but there’s a fair degree of diversity in what you can read and what you can choose to read.” FRSU38’s commitment to equity and diverse representation in academic content is a strength of the districts.

### DESE Recommendations

* *The districts should clarify the instructional vision and develop a plan to disseminate this vision to all staff members, students, and families.*
* *Frontier should develop a consistent curricular review process that supports the selection and implementation of high-quality instructional materials across grades and subject areas at the secondary level.*
* *The districts should review its system for ensuring horizontal and vertical curricular alignment within and across grade levels and subject areas, as well as addressing any misconceptions around alignment.*
* *The districts should set clear expectations for instructional practices at the secondary level to ensure consistency, alignment with the instructional vision, and stronger student engagement.*

## Assessment

This section examines the extent to which, through the establishment of strategic data and assessment systems, the districts support a robust, data-centered culture that advances equitable student experiences and outcomes. It also focuses on the extent to which the districts collect an array of data to inform decisions at the classroom, school, and district levels as well as the ways in which, by analyzing assessment results and other data, educators develop an understanding of the whole student, can examine trends across student groups, and can adjust their instruction accordingly.

Table 5 summarizes key strengths and areas for growth in assessment in FRSU38.

Table 5. Summary of Key Strengths and Areas for Growth: Assessment Standard

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Indicator | Strengths | Areas for growth |
| [Data Collection](#_Data_Collection) | * The amount and variety of academic and nonacademic data collected about each student provide administrators and teachers with a comprehensive understanding of students. | * Developing common assessments at the secondary level to reduce variations among teachers |
| [Data Use and Culture](#_Data_Use_and) | * The use of data to inform decisions at both the district and school levels is effective. * The systems to support data literacy, staff access of data, and data analysis. |  |
| [Sharing Data](#_Sharing_Data) | * The elementary schools use consistent grading practices. | * Establishing consistent expectations for sharing information with students and parents on how students are doing in their classes * Establishing transparent and accessible common rubrics that are calibrated horizontally and vertically for all secondary departments and content areas |

### Data Collection

The two directors of education for FRSU38 oversee assessments. Central office and school staff spoke to gathering multiple types of academic and nonacademic data on each student, which leaders expressed provides a comprehensive understanding of each student. School leaders noted that they are able to review comprehensive data during PLCs that allow them to understand a full picture of each student. Elementary teachers noted that academic and nonacademic data are available for all students, and the nonacademic data are incorporated while they are reviewing academic data. Table 6 outlines the assessments used in FRSU38. The amount and variety of academic and nonacademic data collected about each student that provides administrators and teachers a comprehensive understanding of students is a strength of FRSU38.

Table 6. Assessments Used in FRSU38

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Assessment | Grade(s) | Time of administration |
| Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS) a | K-6 | Fall, winter, and spring |
| Words Their Way a | K-6 | Fall, winter, and spring |
| Universal Screener for Number Sense a | K-6 | Fall and winter |
| Phonological Awareness Screening Test (PAST) Letter ID and Sound a | K | Fall, winter, and spring |
| Developmental Indicators for the Assessment of Learning (DIAL) a | K | Fall |
| Devereux Student Strengths Assessment (DESSA) Screener b | K-6 | Two times of administration |
| NWEA Map | 3-7 | Fall, winter, and spring |
| MCAS | 3-8 and 10 | Spring |
| ELA and mathematics Preliminary SAT (PSAT) | 8 and 9 | Fall |
| ELA and mathematics PSAT/National Merit Scholarship Qualifying Test (NMSQT) | 10 | Fall |
| ELA, mathematics, and science IXL | 9-12 | Multiple times per year |
| ALEKS | 6-8 | Multiple times per year |

a These are universal screeners used across elementary schools in FRSU38. b Schools with more than 150 students administer DESSA Screener.

According to school and central office staff, FRSU38 leaders strategically select and implement universal and curriculum-based assessments that align with instructional content; however, FRSU38 do not publicly share the assessment plan or schedule. In Grades K-6, the four elementary schools within U38 use DIBELS, Words Their Way Spelling Inventory, and Universal Screener for Number Sense multiple times per year. For Grades 3-7, all five schools in FRSU38 use MAP, which is administered three times per year in the elementary schools and two times per year for seventh-grade students at Frontier Regional School. Teachers use the formative and summative assessments included in the elementary ELA and mathematics curricula in addition to these universal assessments and screeners. Elementary teachers also noted that included in the curricula are other opportunities for staff to assess students’ learning.

At the secondary level, Frontier Regional School uses ALEKS in Grades 6-8, the PSAT in Grades 8-10, and IXL in Grades 9-12 as an assessment to measure skill development among specific student populations. Staff also examine annual MCAS data. Departments vary on their use of common assessments, which directors of education noted as a challenge they are hoping to address in coming years. For example, middle school mathematics teachers use common assessments, and other departments did not report using common formative assessments. High school teachers noted that all mathematics teachers write their own assessments and there are no common assessments, ELA teachers are working at having common assessments, and there are common assessments in social studies if there are multiple sections of the same class. Developing common assessments at the secondary level to reduce variations among teachers is an area for growth for FRS.

The directors of education shared that they have done a lot of professional development at the secondary level on equity, antiracism, and diversity related to assessment. For the elementary level, the directors of education noted that they use several research-based universal assessments and consider equity and biases when reviewing achievement results. These efforts reflect how FRSU38 view assessment as a key part of their broader commitment to equity.

### Data Use and Culture

Document review and central office and school staff focus group responses indicate that staff in FRSU38 have a shared understanding of the importance of data collection, and there are the beginnings of a universal data vision. According to the FRSU38 Assessment Management Plan, assessments in FRSU38 serve multiple purposes, including the following:

Assessments inform instructional practices and curricular decisions. They drive professional development and contribute to program evaluation. Assessments help identify strengths and challenges of individual students, and they help identify similarities and differences in growth and achievement among student demographic groups, providing the district with essential information and accountability for equitable learning outcomes.

FRSU38 staff noted that during the past few years, the use of data has increased in FRSU38, and they are implementing a stronger and more aligned data culture than they previously had.

According to FRSU38 leaders, staff regularly use grades, attendance, SST reports, behavioral evaluations, office referrals, and suspensions to evaluate students’ academic, social-emotional, and behavioral needs. FRSU38 review IEPs, MCAS, ACCESS, AP scores, and SAT/ACT scores annually. Most data, including grades, attendance, SST reports, MCAS, AP scores, and SAT/ACT scores, are disaggregated by specific categories, namely, race and/or ethnicity, gender, low-income status, High Needs status, and disability status. Data collected also are used to inform district planning, decision making, policies, and practices. For example, student-level data influenced FRSU38 to implement the innovation pathways in the secondary level. After the COVID-19 pandemic, according to leaders from the districts, data showed that student engagement was relatively low in electives and that students were interested in courses that were not offered in the school. As a result, leaders added innovation pathways and new electives to the course offerings, and the districts have noticed a significant shift in enrollment in these courses. In addition, academic scores, including early reading data, attendance data, and teacher-level data, were used to determine the order for curriculum review during the 2022-2023 school year. School leaders noted the use of data in their data meetings, in which they work with teachers to review data and make sure that students are receiving the supports they need. The use of data to inform decisions at both the district and school levels is a strength of FRSU38.

According to school leaders and teachers, educators have access to relevant data and have resources necessary for understanding and analysis. FRSU38 recently adopted the Open Architects dashboard for central office leaders, school leaders, and teachers to use while reviewing data. The tool is relatively new for the districts, so there is still learning among central office and school staff. Principals noted that with the new tool, they are able to look into data further than before; however, there is a need to increase the group’s skillset to disaggregate data. Teacher understanding and use of data are supported through professional development, access to data analysis tools, and planning and collaborative time. All the elementary schools hold grade-level data meetings monthly, in which they review academic and nonacademic data on each student. At the secondary level, they review student-level data during a student intervention team meeting every two weeks. In addition, the directors of education noted that they held data meetings, starting last year, with content areas from the middle and high school, leading to the development of PLCs to review data this year. The systems to support data literacy, staff access to data, and data analysis are a strength of FRSU38.

### Sharing Data

FRSU38 central office leaders and staff primarily use PowerSchool to share grades on assignments, overall course grades, and assessment scores with students and families. In addition, elementary teachers reported sharing report cards, DIBELS results, and daily work folders with families.

Middle and high school students agree that they can check their grades on PowerSchool. These focus group participants also noted that teachers do not frequently communicate with them how they are doing in the class. A middle school student reported, “I think the only way that your teacher would communicate with you or your parent/guardian is if you’re not doing well, and that’s usually in the form of an email.” High school students agree with this sentiment, and one student added, “I wish we were given a bit more feedback. Like if we could add more information on how we’re doing.”

Teachers reported that they share student information with families regularly. Parents noted that they receive more information from elementary teachers than they do from middle and high school teachers. At the elementary level, parents did note that there was variation in the amount of communication they receive depending on the teacher. Establishing consistent expectations for sharing information with students and parents on how students are doing in their classes is an area of growth for FRSU38.

The directors of education noted that grading alignment differed for elementary and secondary schools. At the elementary level, there are rubrics for ELA and common mathematics assessments across all four elementary schools. Elementary teachers reported that there are ways to calibrate grading across the schools, including grade-level team meetings, in which they review student work and coalesce around uniform expectations, along with a common report card that is used across all schools. A review of the student handbook confirms that there are grading norms and rubrics for Grades K-6. The use of consistent grading practices across the elementary schools is a strength of the districts.

At the secondary level, central office staff reported a plan to use PLCs to establish rubrics to make sure that grading is equitable for middle and high school students. Middle and high school teachers noted that grading practices vary by department and subject area. Staff said that common rubrics are used in some departments, but not in others. In addition, middle and high school students noted variation in how frequently teachers update their grades on PowerSchool. Establishing transparent and accessible common rubrics that are calibrated horizontally and vertically for all secondary departments and content areas is an area for growth for FRS.

According to central office leaders, there are dedicated staff responsible for reviewing and monitoring the digital platforms that collect, store, and share student data to ensure ongoing compliance with student data privacy laws and regulations. In addition, central office staff reported that FRSU38 do offer professional learning for staff concerning student data privacy laws, policies, and best practices for safeguarding student information. FRSU38 maintain a detailed technology policy.

### DESE Recommendations

* *FRS should work with its teachers to develop common assessments to support consistency and alignment across courses.*
* *The districts should establish clear expectations for teachers to update students and their families on academic progress regularly.*
* *FRS should work within and across its academic departments to develop common rubrics and expectations around grading assignments within each content area.*

## Human Resources and Professional Development

This section examines the extent to which the districts have established systems, policies, and practices that allow administrators to effectively recruit, hire, onboard, and support a highly effective, diverse, and culturally responsive workforce. It also focuses on the systems and structures that the districts use to provide all educators with ongoing access to high-quality professional learning and actionable feedback as well as establishes a culture that fosters collaboration, retention, recognition, and advancement.

Table 7 summarizes key strengths and areas for growth in human resources and professional development in FRSU38.

Table 7. Summary of Key Strengths and Areas for Growth: Human Resources and Professional Development Standard

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Indicator | Strengths | Areas for growth |
| [Human Resources Infrastructure, Policies, and Practices](#_Human_Resources_Infrastructure,) |  | * Developing simplified human resources processes and communicating these procedures to staff |
| [Staffing](#_Staffing) | * The districts highlight areas of strength of teachers through the evaluation process. | * Implementing strategies to recruit a more diverse workforce that is representative of the student body * Addressing the professional needs of instructional assistants, including turnover and more consistent onboarding * Providing consistent feedback for administrators * Consistently completing all components of the evaluation process for staff, including areas of improvement and measurable goals |
| [Professional Learning](#_Professional_Learning) | * FRSU38 have a commitment to develop schedules for all teachers to collaborate with peers. * The mentorship program is structured and effective. | * Providing additional professional development opportunities for instructional assistants |

### Human Resources Infrastructure, Policies, and Practices

According to interviews, FRSU38 do not have a dedicated human resources person; rather, several staff, including the superintendent, the director of business administration, and a payroll specialist, divide responsibilities for maintaining employee records, controlling positions, posting vacancies, and supporting school leaders in human resources policies and procedures. The superintendent performs a number of human resources duties personally, including reviewing the hiring process that principals lead as well as working with the director of business administration to handle paperwork needs such as medical leave. The central office leaders also monitor pertinent employment statuses. Central office leaders reported that their office keeps a master staff list for all five schools and retains all applications, transcripts, and teacher certifications from the time a person is hired. The central office also tracks teachers’ licensure and when they are expiring, which includes sending educators “warning letters” if their licensure is about to expire or has expired.

The districts have clearly documented human resources policies that set expectations for staff, including individuals who are not members of a collective bargaining unit. FRS has an *Employee Handbook Supplement* that supplements the *Frontier Regional and Union #38 School District - Online Policy Manual*, which is the school committees’ manual that governs the districts and follows the classification system developed by the National School Boards Association. The handbook includes a calendar and schedules; classroom and teaching guidelines; general employment policies; general building policies and procedures; health, safety, and prevention of harm; social media policy; and a procedure for complaints and grievances. The districts also have a handbook for employees who are not members of a collective bargaining unit. This handbook includes information about salaries and wages, job classifications, leaves of absence, procedures to resolve issues, and other items.

Still, according to staff from the central office and teacher representatives, some aspects of human resources management can be confusing, because FRSU38 operate in some ways as a single district and in other ways as multiple, independent school districts. Multiple interview and focus group participants reported that the districts can be difficult to navigate from a human resources perspective as a result of this dichotomy. FRS staff are employees of the regional school district, whereas staff at the four elementary schools are employees of their respective towns. Document maintenance—which is a shared responsibility of the central office and the four constituent towns—can be a major source of confusion because of this separation. For Frontier Regional School employees, the central office is the one point of contact to access their W-2s, benefits, and other employee records. However, employees of the elementary school districts have two points of contact: the central office for their benefits and their respective towns for their payroll. The central office maintains only paper-based employee records as confirmed by interviews with central office staff. Adding to the complexity is that some employees work across different schools in the districts, meaning that they are employees of multiple towns. As an example, the four elementary schools share specials teachers, such as music teachers, across campuses. Interview and focus group respondents reported that it can be confusing to know where to go for information or to correct issues in documentation or payroll.

There are four CBAs within FRSU38: two cover Frontier employees and two cover U38 employees. The four elementary districts all sign separate but identical CBAs independently with each school committee. If a person works at Frontier Regional School and at one or more of the elementary schools, which is the case for service providers such as occupational or physical therapists, they work under multiple contracts.

Governing human resources across towns can be a complex endeavor within FRSU38, even with a common CBA. Staff noted that, whereas the four elementary districts ostensibly have identical teacher contracts, benefits contributions vary across towns, which results, in practical terms, in variations in compensation despite having identical salary scales. The town with the greatest fractional share is responsible for the employees’ benefits in cases of employees who work across multiple schools. For instance, if an employee works 55 percent at Frontier Regional School and 45 percent at an elementary school, then FRS covers the benefits. The central office has the responsibility of making sure that certain employees are paid from the correct town’s accounts and that the correct town covers their benefits. The central office also tracks sick time for all employees, whereas towns manage health insurance. In addition to the benefits structure, another example of the complexity of multiple contracts is the sick leave and leave of absence process. Central office leaders described the importance of following established human resources procedures, explaining that “it is really complicated for our employees.”

These complexities notwithstanding, central office leaders reported that employees can access their employment information, provided the right person contacts the right source. One central office leader explained that it is “just really directing them to the correct person.” However, a recent example underscores the confusion that can result from the complex arrangement in FRSU38. A central office leader described a staff member who came to the central office for assistance because they believed that their federal tax deductions were not accurately withheld. The central office, however, did not have access to the town’s payroll system and thus could not see the person’s records. Similarly, a town government employee explained that “we struggle with HR” because of the complexities of having multiple towns work with the central office, including in cases where staff are employees of multiple districts. Teacher focus group participants also agree that navigating human resources issues can be complicated. Developing simplified human resources processes and communicating procedures to staff are areas for growth for the districts.

According to members of both teachers’ associations, the topic of grievances is clearly defined within the CBAs, and the processes to resolve staff conflicts and grievances depend on the nature of the conflict. However, the process to resolve teacher-to-teacher conflicts is less clear. Similarly, central office leaders agree that the districts have policies and procedures in place to professionally and promptly respond to grievances and misconduct, which district leaders said occur infrequently. Staff misconduct is handled at the level where the misconduct is occurring. Central office leaders support school leaders, acting as “a proofreader” to make sure the leaders are following proper policy and procedures to discipline. If the issue cannot be resolved at the school level, then it escalates to the central office.

### Staffing

Central office leaders have policies and processes in place to hire and onboard new staff. A document entitled “Frontier Regional and U38 Hiring Procedure” enumerates an eight-step process: defining equal opportunity employment in the process and job descriptions, posting and advertising, conducting the application process, forming a hiring committee, screening and evaluation, determining which candidates meet selection criteria, making an offer of employment, and ending with onboarding. Documents also indicate that the districts maintain sample postings, interview questions, and hiring rubrics. According to central office and school leaders, the five principals are responsible for hiring. They post the positions and create the team of school-based staff that conducts candidate interviews. Members of the central office, such as a director of education or student support services, participate on these teams for hiring special education specialists and classroom teacher positions. Principals characterized themselves as having a high level of autonomy in the hiring process.

Interview and focus group respondents at the central office and school levels reported that, whereas principals lead hiring, central office staff provided a training for school leaders on the hiring process. This training included work on creating job descriptions as well as diversity in hiring and how to look for biases in the process. School leaders described that training as “helpful.” Yet leaders reported challenges with increasing diversity in the districts because of the limited number of applicants for all posted positions, especially those in mathematics and science. Nonetheless, another leader shared that they thought the districts could do more individually and as a collective to recruit a more diverse staff. The leader pointed to the proximity of the University of Massachusetts Amherst and the university’s education department as a potential source of more applicants overall and a more diverse applicant pool. Upon later review, the superintendent agreed that the districts regularly recruit from the University of Massachusetts, but that over the past 20 years, all candidates have been white, highlighting the persistent regional challenge in diversifying the educator pipeline. According to DESE staffing data, in 2023-2024, although the share of Hispanic or Latino students at the five school districts ranged from 2.8 percent to 13.1 percent, only 3 percent of Whately’s teachers were Hispanic or Latino, 1 percent of Frontier’s teachers were Hispanic or Latino, and none of Conway’s, Deerfield’s, or Sunderland’s teachers were Hispanic or Latino. Implementing strategies to recruit a more diverse workforce that is representative of the student body is an area for growth for the districts.

To help onboard new hires, the superintendent leads a new teacher orientation before school starts. The day is divided between common time together for all new hires and time at their individual schools. According to the superintendent, the time together focuses on equity in education “so that all five schools are hearing the same kind of talk out of the gate of what that means to us in our district.” In addition, new hires receive technology and other topical training before breaking out into groups led by the different principals. Teacher focus group participants reported variation in onboarding across the five buildings depending on the administrators in those buildings. One teacher described their onboarding as “pretty unstructured.” New hires also get mentoring support, which is described in further detail in the Professional Learning section below. Teacher focus group participants raised concerns about the onboarding process for instructional assistants (IAs), describing it as “not robust enough.” Teachers reported that the onboarding for IAs is different in each building and that the districts lack an overall orientation process for these common roles. One building’s process includes a slide deck that is offered at the beginning of the year. In a different school, a teacher reported a meeting for IAs that is held the day before the first day of school. A related issue is a relatively high turnover rate for IAs in the districts. One teacher reported that because of high turnover of IAs, many IAs start after the beginning of the year, and then the classroom teacher they support is responsible for onboarding new hires because the districts do not offer a midyear orientation. As an example, a teacher explained that they were on the third IA of the year in that teacher’s classroom. Addressing the professional needs of IAs, including turnover and more consistent onboarding of IAs, is an area for growth.

According to central office leaders, the districts primarily use academic, enrollment, mental health, and survey data to assess staffing needs across schools. The superintendent confirmed that he uses data sources from across schools to assess staffing needs. The districts added another special education teacher in seventh grade because of the number of students with disabilities in that grade. Similarly, the districts created a position at Frontier Regional School for a counselor to implement restorative justice practices because the districts saw an increase in behavioral issues and frustration occurring in middle and high school students.

School leaders and teacher focus group participants reported that, after teachers are hired, educator evaluations are conducted in accordance with staff contracts. Principals reported that leaders engage in “calibrating,” including using common tools, to create more consistency across schools. FRSU38 uses DESE’s rubric for educator evaluations. Because their old system was difficult to navigate, the districts are currently in the process of switching platforms to Vector, and the superintendent reported that the new interface is much easier to use. School leaders described using a consistent platform for classroom observations as well as administrative walkthroughs and debriefs as their strategy to create consistency across the different schools. Teacher focus group participants reported that leaders always share feedback. Teachers also shared, however, that how evaluators share that feedback often depends on the nature of the feedback and that teachers are less likely to hear directly about positive feedback. Teachers reported that they can consistently access feedback reports on their own in the Vector platform.

For the 2023-2024 school year, the districts used MyLearningPlan via Frontline for teacher evaluations. AIR used simple random sampling to select the sample of 10 teachers out of 83 teachers due for summative evaluations for the 2023-2024 school year. Almost all (nine) teachers selected for review had a summative evaluation available for review. Of those nine, eight of the teacher evaluations available for review were incomplete and omitted required components, including a rating for each standard or an overall rating. None included a student learning SMART (specific, measurable, achievable, realistic, and timely) goal and a professional practice SMART goal. All (100 percent) summative evaluations included feedback for each standard and overall feedback related to the teacher’s overall rating. Of the nine teacher evaluations that included feedback, all evaluations named strengths or practices that the teacher should continue; however, only seven (78 percent) evaluations included feedback indicating areas for improvement.

For administrator evaluations, the districts also used MyLearningPlan via Frontline for the 2023-2024 school year. Of the five administrative district staff who were due for a summative evaluation for the 2023-2024 school year, all evaluations were available for review. Four of five evaluations were complete with performance ratings and assessment of progress toward goals. None of the evaluations included student learning, professional practice, or school improvement SMART goals. In addition, all (four) administrator evaluations reviewed included comments with specific, actionable feedback naming each administrator’s strengths; however, only one evaluation identified areas for improvement.

Taken together, the review of teacher and administrator evaluations indicates a strength of the districts is in highlighting areas of strength through the evaluation process for teachers and administrators. On the other hand, this evidence also highlights two areas for growth in the districts. First, an area for growth for FRSU38 is consistently providing feedback for administrators. The second area for growth is addressing the need to consistently complete all components of the evaluation process for staff, including areas of improvement and measurable goals. It also is necessary for teachers and administrators to develop student learning and professional practice goals to positively influence enhanced student outcomes, professional growth, accountability, and reflection.

With regard to staff recognition, central office leaders reported nominating teachers annually for the Harold Grinspoon Foundation Excellence in Teaching Award, offered by a foundation to honor educators in western Massachusetts. In contrast, teacher focus group participants did not report any centralized processes to acknowledge their work and effort, outside of recognizing teachers who have been in the districts for 20 years. One teacher stated that “it is rare that any of us get any kind of celebration.” Multiple teachers explained that recognition of their efforts is school based and dependent on the different school leaders.

In relation to career advancement, central office leaders reported promoting from within the districts as opportunities for teachers to advance. Whereas teachers noted that opportunities are more limited compared with larger districts in their part of the state, they reported opportunities to join different committees—such as a curriculum planning committee—as a way to participate in the decision making. The districts offer teachers opportunities for distributed leadership, including grade-level and specialist-level leaders, department chairs, roles on schools’ ILTs, and mentoring roles. In addition, both central office staff and teachers described self-directed professional development, in which teachers are offered $600 per year and the funds can be used to pay for courses and for graduate credits. According to central office interviews and documents, the districts support teachers in acquiring additional credentials and licenses. For example, the districts paid for LETRS training and Orton-Gillingham training for all educators who were interested. FRSU38 support teachers in presenting at and attending educational conferences. In fall 2024, two teachers presented at a Right to Read Community Event hosted by Smith College, and in the spring, two teachers planned to attend the National Science Teaching Association conference in Philadelphia.

With the exception of Frontier Regional School, the retention rates of all other schools in the districts are higher than the state average, according to DESE staffing data. Frontier’s retention rate of 82.3 percent was lower than the state average of 85.8 percent in 2023-2024. The retention rates of the four elementary schools ranged from 88.5 percent to 100 percent. However, as noted above, teacher focus group participants reported high turnover rates among IAs. They also stated that most of the instructional staff turnover is among early educators, those new to the profession. Consistent with that statement and according to DESE staffing data, at three schools in 2023-2024, the share of experienced teachers is greater than the state average of 80.8 percent. In contrast, the share of experienced teachers at Conway and Sunderland is 76.0 percent and 77.4 percent, respectively, both less than the state average. Teacher focus group participants shared that the most common reason they believe that staff leave is compensation, including money and benefits. Consistent with this report, DESE staffing data (2020-2021) indicate that the average teacher salary in the districts ranged from $7,667 to $25,065 lower than the state average in the constituent districts (although the four elementary districts have the same CBA and salary schedule, average salaries vary because of differences in average levels of experience, according to central office staff). Upon review, the superintendent acknowledged the disparity but flagged that salaries in rural western Massachusetts tend to be lower than eastern Massachusetts, where cost of living and average incomes are significantly higher. In addition to concerns about salary and benefits, teachers added that teacher burnout also contributes to teachers’ decisions to leave their positions.

Teachers did not describe how the central office of the districts fosters a positive, productive, and inclusive work environment for staff; rather, teacher focus group participants reported that efforts to foster a sense of belonging happen largely at the school level and vary across the five schools. Moreover, at some schools, teachers take the lead to build community. Focus group participants described teachers eating lunch together weekly, having monthly potlucks with themes, and planning monthly birthday breakfast celebrations for staff. One school leader gives all staff members a school t-shirt at the beginning of the year, and then on certain days, all staff wear their matching t-shirts. However, teachers reported that the professional development that occurs across the districts is helpful in allowing teachers to meet with teachers across schools and helps to create a sense of belonging across FRSU38 schools. In addition, teachers agree that the leaders in the central office listen to feedback and try “to respond to feedback within the best of their ability.”

### Professional Learning

FRSU38 offer multiple professional learning opportunities, including observations of and feedback for teachers, frequent professional development sessions on early release Fridays, several full- or half-day professional development sessions, collaboration time for all teachers, and structured support for new teachers. With regard to observations and feedback, the districts devote part of monthly administrative meetings, which include central office leaders, school leaders, and assistant principals, to conducting classroom observations together, rotating across the schools. School leaders explained that these common walkthroughs and use of common instruments helped to keep them “on the same page” and gave them confidence that any leader could conduct an observation at any school and they would have the same outcome. A document entitled “Classroom Walkthrough FRSU38” provides details of the topics that are observed during walkthroughs, which include lesson/activity objective, student instructional mode, teacher instructional mode, checks for understanding and student feedback, student understanding, engagement strategies, student engagement, and notes. The form also includes a space for teachers to reflect on the feedback that they receive.

Despite this common approach to observations, teacher focus group participants stated that the frequency of observations varied across schools. Teachers at the secondary level shared that they would like more feedback following observations. One teacher stated, “I love being observed, personally. But the one thing I wish happened more here was getting feedback. I don’t remember ever getting feedback from an observation.” According to teacher focus group participants, some coaching is available. An external coach provides coaching for all teachers who are new to the high school and for more experienced teachers who need additional support. In addition, elementary school teachers who were implementing new curricula could request coaching support. The district also provides coaching through its mentoring program for early career educators, as described below. Outside of these cases, the districts do not provide access to individualized coaching support.

FRSU38 offer professional development on early release Fridays (approximately 20 sessions over the course of the year) as well as during a small number of half- or full-day sessions. The early release Fridays are a mix of districtwide professional development that is planned by the two directors of education and school-based professional development planned by the principals. FRSU38’s professional development plan aligns with the Massachusetts professional development standards. A document entitled “Professional Development Plan: Frontier Regional and Union #38 School Districts” from 2022 provides an overview of FRSU38’s approach to professional development. It includes using data to identify goals; creating a plan for implementation; implementing professional development that includes using research about effective pedagogical practices; providing choice, differentiated learning, and collaboration; and monitoring progress. The mission of the professional development is “building learning communities, one student, one teacher, one family at a time,” and the vision is “vibrant, collaborative, and engaging communities promoting the growth of every student.”

The superintendent emphasized the importance of crafting professional development that aligns with the districts’ strategic plan. Another central office leader stressed that FRSU38 leaders strive for sustained professional development offered during early release Fridays, as opposed to one-time sessions. The districts have focused on equity and diversity for the past three years, according to focus group participants. This year, MTSS, an action step in the second objective of FRSU38’s strategic plan, was the focus. At the same time, central office leaders recognized the need to sometimes differentiate among schools, based on teacher feedback and teacher and department proposals. For instance, one of the elementary schools, responding to teachers’ concerns about the narrative writing in the new ELA curriculum, has planned an upcoming professional development session that will focus on that topic.

Teacher focus group participants stated mixed views about the utility of the professional development and the extent to which their feedback is incorporated into planning professional learning opportunities. Although elementary teachers reported feeling supported through professional development as they implement new curricula, they also noted that the professional development can sometimes be repetitive. In addition, a teacher stated that it would be better to have a common theme for the year to be able to “really dive deeper.” With regard to feedback, teachers at the secondary level reported that their input was not incorporated into the types of professional learning opportunities offered. In contrast, elementary school teachers stated that a director of education solicits their feedback through surveys and conversations and that central leaders are responsive to their suggestions.

Central office leaders and teacher focus group participants agreed that there is insufficient professional development for IAs. There are certain days when they have their own professional development, according to interviews, but a central office leader explained that IAs can only infrequently join on Fridays, as they provide childcare on days with early release to cover the gap between release time and afterschool care. Several schools try to rotate between which IAs provide childcare for students and which ones attend the professional development sessions. Multiple teacher focus group participants described the lack of professional development for IAs as a “big issue,” given the role they play in classrooms, and that when they can attend, the sessions are not necessarily always relevant for their needs. Providing additional professional development opportunities for IAs is an area of growth for the districts.

In focus groups, school leaders, central office leaders, and teachers agree that teachers have regular time to collaborate with other educators, although some teachers noted the lack of opportunity to collaborate with their IAs. Teachers at all grade levels often have opportunities to collaborate during the Friday professional development sessions. In addition, teachers at the secondary level have team meetings twice a week and monthly departmental meetings. At the two elementary schools that have multiple sections of grades, teachers have daily shared preparation times. Two of the elementary schools have one teacher per grade level. In schools where teachers may be the only staff at their grade level, those teachers are provided with time to collaborate with other colleagues across grade-band levels. They also meet twice a month with school leaders, specialists for English Learners and Students with Disabilities, guidance counselors, and other nonacademic support staff. In addition, elementary school teachers meet three to four times a year with all other teachers at their grade level across the districts. These meetings, which are held in person, require release time to cover travel to the meeting as well as the meeting time and substitute teachers coverage. Calling it a “struggle,” the superintendent reported that people hold different views about the value of these meetings, given the amount of time it takes to attend and hold them. Whereas the small size of these schools presents challenges to creating opportunities for teachers to collaborate, central office and school leaders emphasized the importance of supporting teachers who are the only staff at their grade level in smaller schools, so that one person is not trying to address issues alone. Multiple elementary school teachers, including in schools with one teacher per grade, agree that they have a lot of time to collaborate. The commitment to develop schedules for all teachers to collaborate with peers is a strength of the districts.

Teacher focus group participants indicated that the districts provide new educators with the resources to be successful, in addition to collaboration time, such as pairing them with a mentor. Central office leaders highlighted a tiered mentorship program for new teachers within the districts based on experience levels. All educators new to the districts receive mentor support for one year, and all novice educators receive mentoring for two years. One teacher manages this initiative for all districts. The *Frontier Regional and Union #38 School Districts Mentor Handbook* details the roles and responsibilities of mentors, new teachers, principals, the central office, and the school committee. The handbook includes suggested activities for each month throughout the year. According to the handbook, “the building principal will pair trained mentors with new teachers as soon as possible after the new teacher is hired,” and it enumerates the criteria for matching mentors and mentees.

Multiple teachers at both the elementary and secondary levels shared positive experiences with the mentoring program. One teacher explained liking the new teacher meeting because “it really was a place for you to connect with people that were also new and, like, bounce ideas off of each other.” Another teacher described it as a place to get support, stating that “it felt personal in a really good way that was accessible and not overwhelming, not daunting.” A different teacher said, “I still go to my mentor whenever I have questions. We meet weekly just to catch up.” Although multiple teachers recognized the strength of the mentoring program, a few teachers had some recommendations for improving the program. Some staff reported that mentoring and onboarding roles are not identical and that mentors should be allowed to focus on mentoring. Noting that there is a “fine line between onboarding and what mentors do,” a teacher suggested that the districts’ central office should be responsible for certain onboarding tasks, such as how to write a report card or request a substitute teacher, and other tasks should be the responsibility of schools. They recommended clearer delineation between the superintendency’s responsibility and the mentor’s responsibility. Overall, the structured and effective mentorship program is a strength of the districts.

### DESE Recommendations

* *The districts should streamline and simplify their human resources procedures and develop a system for efficiently directing staff to the appropriate individual and/or department as needed.*
* *The districts should continue to implement recruitment strategies that prioritize hiring diverse and effective staff.*
* *The districts should develop a consistent and robust onboarding process for instructional assistants that can be implemented both at the beginning of the year and when new staff are hired.*
* *The districts should issue guidance and provide additional oversight around providing feedback, including areas for growth, for administrator evaluations.*
* *The districts must align their educator evaluation process with regulatory requirements so that all educators set a minimum of two goals, all educators receive one of four ratings on each Performance Standard, and all educators (teachers and administrators) have a summative evaluation.*
  + *Additional resources for Educator Evaluation can be found* [*here*](https://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/implementation/default.html)*.*
* *The districts should examine and address the barriers to providing consistent professional development to their instructional assistants.*

## Student Support

This section focuses on the extent to which the districts support the whole student by creating safe and supportive environments, meeting students’ health and well-being needs, and engaging all families. It also focuses on the extent to which these supports are built on robust MTSS that flexibly assess and address each student’s academic, social-emotional, and behavioral strengths and needs.

Table 8 summarizes key strengths and areas for growth in student support in FRSU38.

Table 8. Summary of Key Strengths and Areas for Growth: Student Support Standard

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Indicator | Strengths | Areas for growth |
| [Safe and Supportive School Climate and Culture](#_Safe_and_Supportive) | * A safe and supportive climate has been established for staff and students. * There are opportunities for students to provide feedback and exercise leadership across all levels. |  |
| [Health and Well-Being](#_Tiered_Systems_of) | * The mental and behavioral health services offered by FRSU38 to support students’ mental and emotional well-being are a strength. |  |
| [Family and Community Partnerships](#_Family_and_Community) |  | * Providing guidance and setting expectations on family communication |
| [Multitiered Systems of Support](#_Multi-Tiered_Systems_of) | * The clear and defined guidance and training concerning MTSS across all schools in FRSU38 allow for cohesive supports for students. |  |

### Safe and Supportive School Climate and Culture

The directors of education and director of student services are central office employees who oversee student supports in FRSU38. Under their guidance is the special education department, ESL teachers, and MTSS. Schools in FRSU38 also have counselors who support students. In addition, the superintendent and other central office leaders reported that all schools have teams to assess student needs, assign academic and behavior interventions, and support communication among staff. Schools refer to these teams as SST, student-intervention-team, or response-to-intervention team. Regardless, these teams work to identify, monitor, and address student needs. FRSU38 leadership have developed and shared several plans with the school community to maintain safe and supportive environments for all students, including a multiple hazard evacuation plan, an emergency response plan, a bullying prevention plan and an attendance policy.

FRSU38 central office and school staff and students reported that the general climate and culture are safe and supportive. According to FRSU38 leaders, the districts collect and use an annual health survey, school surveys, and referrals to regularly monitor school and district culture. In addition, some schools within the districts conduct a school climate survey. Middle and high school students generally reported feeling welcome, respected, and safe at Frontier Regional School. Most middle school focus group participants reported that they always feel safe and respected at school; however, some participants mentioned that there are some social conflicts that arise, but these are limited instances. High school students noted that they believe their school is a safe place, that there are teachers who care about them in both an academic and a personal way, and that staff work to quickly fix any problems. One student did report,

The only downside of this school, at least for me, would be the diversity because this school is like 80 percent White, which isn’t the school’s fault, but…they do pay a good attention to making it inclusive for all people.

CLASS scores in the middle to high range for Positive Climate and Teacher Sensitivity support the safe and supportive climate and culture present in FRSU38. The established safe and supportive climate for staff and students is a strength of FRSU38.

According to the attendance policy manual, FRSU38 implement effective strategies to increase student attendance and engagement to prevent and mitigate the effects of chronic absenteeism. These strategies include supportive and nonpunitive modes of engagement and learning that involve school, student, and family input. Central office leaders and school staff reported that they monitor attendance closely and work with families if students have a high number of absences. Frontier Regional School student support staff members reported that in previous years, students struggled with transitioning from the middle school to high school academic attendance policies, which states students can lose credit in high school from a certain days absent in a semester, As a result, the middle school implemented a “trial run” of the high school attendance policy, in which students receive letters home and have attendance meetings with the principal. In addition, in the past school year, after reviewing attendance data, FRSU38 leaders held a listening session for families to share ideas for improving student attendance. During the session, central office staff heard from families that the social-emotional climate in the school is a barrier for attendance for some students, for example some parents shared their student is lonely in school. This led the districts to implement a social-emotional curriculum. Despite these efforts, families still reported that although they did voice these concerns about barriers for students attending school, they do not believe that effective changes have been implemented. Students reported that their attendance is monitored and updated in PowerSchool and there is an attendance office at Frontier Regional School. In addition, they reported that teachers will allow students to make up missed work, but the responsibility to find out what is missing falls on the student.

During focus groups, school leaders and teachers discussed some meaningful ways that students give feedback and exercise leadership in their schools. For example, the diversity leadership team at Deerfield Elementary is a team of fourth-, fifth-, and sixth-grade students who apply and are chosen by the previous cohort of students. In addition, at Conway Grammar, teachers shared that students have started clubs based on their interests (e.g., a Dungeons and Dragons club), and they have school meetings that are completely student-led. Middle school students noted that some teachers ask students to share their learning style or what they have covered in previous years, but teachers do not generally ask for feedback on their teaching. High school students agree with this, and one student noted,

It really depends on the teacher. Some teachers will not accept an ounce of feedback. . . . But some teachers are pretty receptive. And oftentimes, I think it’s on the own student’s intentionality. You could offer something, and maybe they’ll be receptive, but I think it’s pretty rare for a teacher to request feedback.

At the high school, there is a student council, which students reported is well represented, and student feedback on changes is taken into account. The opportunities for students to provide feedback and exercise leadership across all levels are a strength of FRSU38.

### Health and Well-Being

All elementary schools give students recess time during the day, and students receive a full year of physical education. At Conway Grammar and Whately Elementary, all students receive less than a semester of health; at Deerfield Elementary, Grades K-3 receive less than a semester of health and Grades 4-6 receive one semester of health; and at Sunderland Elementary, Grade 4 receives less than a semester of health and Grades 5 and 6 receive one semester of health. Middle school leaders noted that students receive a semester of physical education and health each year, which is scheduled during the exploratory block. The high school course catalog specifies that all students must complete two health courses and 10 credits of physical education. A small number of high school students reported wanting additional health in the curriculum. In addition, FRSU38 maintains a local wellness policy and an allergy collection and verification protocol.

School staff stated that the districts have robust tiered mental and behavioral health services that support most students’ mental and emotional well-being. For example, FRSU38 employ counselors who provide individual and group counseling in all five schools. Across the elementary schools, there are regular grade-level data meetings in which students are discussed, and there are other meetings that can be used if needed. FRSU38 use multiple nonacademic interventions, such as social-emotional groups and Second Step at elementary schools as well as targeted skill development (TSD; executive functioning classes), The Brookline Center’s bryt support program, and restorative justice practices headed by a restorative justice coordinator at the middle and high school. In addition, according to support staff, FRSU38 assist students and their families and caregivers by providing information and referrals to health providers when requested or needed. Support staff noted that their location in a rural area does present some challenges, such as having only a small number of outside providers in the area. The mental and behavioral health services offered by FRSU38 to support students’ mental and emotional well-being are a strength.

### Family and Community Partnerships

FRSU38 leaders have implemented several strategies to communicate with parents, including principal newsletters, parent-teacher conferences, individual teacher updates, ParentSquare, and school-organized or parent teacher association–organized events. Additionally, the bullying prevention plan, elementary and secondary attendance policies, and student and family handbooks are available on the district websites for families to access. However, FRSU38 and their schools do not provide guidance on family communication, and family focus group participants reported inconsistencies in communication methods and frequency across different schools. In addition to reporting inconsistencies, parents noted that the communication they do receive from central office and school leaders lacks substance and covers only bullet point items or upcoming events. More specifically, several families reported that they would like more communication from Frontier Regional School regarding the school climate. Providing guidance and setting expectations around family communication is an area for growth.

School leaders and staff reported that they maintain relationships with organizations in the community to provide services and enriching experiences to students and families during and outside of the school day. For example, staff described one organization that provided food and other material items for students, especially during major holidays. Whately Elementary partners with the Community Health Center of Franklin County for dental services for their students.

Central office leaders noted that FRSU38 do not have formal wraparound services in all grades, but support staff work individually with students and connect them with other agencies as needed. As mentioned, Frontier Regional School student support staff noted that because of the rural location of these towns, there are limited outside resources to connect students to, so there can be long waitlists for students when connecting with an outside service.

### Multitiered Systems of Support

The districts have provided guidance to all schools on the common characteristics of effective MTSS. FRSU38 clearly define the systems’ three tiers of support and detail how schools in the union apply adapted MTSS to implement interventions for students.

According to central office leaders, school leaders, and teachers, there are Tier 1 academic, social-emotional, and behavioral supports for students—for example, social-emotional friend groups at elementary schools, a middle school advisory period, and restorative justice practices at the secondary level. In addition, schools in FRSU38 provideTier 2 and Tier 3 interventions for students who need additional support to access the curriculum or learning environment, such as small group instruction at the elementary schools and the TSD class at the high school.

FRSU38 provide training for school leaders concerning how to implement each component of the MTSS system. Central office leaders reported that during the past several years, the districts have partnered with The Brookline Center’s bryt team, a group that offers Tier 3 mental health supports in schools, to provide professional development regarding MTSS and also to help schools develop MTSS. Documents provided by the central office include an agenda from November 2024 for a professional development session that offered multiple sessions around MTSS by staff from multiple schools across the districts. Topics included MTSS characteristics, existing FRSU38 resources, and workshops on data use, interventions, and academic as well as nonacademic needs. Each school has an MTSS map that outlines Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 interventions in attendance, academics, social-emotional learning, and mental health and outlines supporting structures and data systems. Whereas all schools have tiered interventions implemented, one area highlighted by a central office leader for continued work is the transition from elementary to middle school, as the interventions and family involvement change.

In addition, FRSU38 implement robust progress monitoring procedures that support access to and movement throughout the three tiers of instruction and support schools in developing schedules that provide teachers with sufficient time to support students who receive Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions. For example, all the elementary schools have some form of regular data meetings in which they can assign students to interventions and also monitor students who are already receiving an intervention. In addition, all schools have some form of SST, response to intervention, or student intervention team. The clear and defined guidance and training concerning MTSS across all schools in FRSU38 allow for cohesive supports for students, a strength of the districts.

### DESE Recommendations

* *The districts should issue guidance around family communication and build a system to monitor its implementation.*

## Financial and Asset Management

This section focuses on the extent to which, through their policies, systems, and procedures, the districts strategically allocate and use funding and other resources in alignment with applicable laws to improve all students’ performance, opportunities, and outcomes. It also focuses on the ways in which the districts collaborate with their partners to run daily operations, manage their assets, and develop long-term plans for sustainability.

Table 9 summarizes key strengths and areas for growth in financial and asset management in FRSU38.

Table 9. Summary of Key Strengths and Areas for Growth: Financial and Asset Management Standard

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Indicator | Strengths | Areas for growth |
| [Business Office Staffing and Infrastructure](#_Business_Office_Staffing) | * The capacity and competency of the districts’ leadership in maintaining municipal relations are a strength. | * Simplifying the financial management of five entities * Creating efficiencies around the maintenance of records * Updating the regional agreement |
| [Budgeting and Budget Process](#_Budgeting_and_Budget) | * The budget development process is thorough, involving multiple stages of review and feedback from principals, school committees, town officials, and the public. | * Addressing how special education is organized across districts * Creating more transparency regarding the posting of budget documents and the stages of the budget process * Aligning the final stages of the budget approval process to limit uncertainty for towns, districts, and central office leadership |
| [Operations](#_Operations) | * The districts provide access to technology, with a Chromebook for each student, and related support, including comprehensive support for remote learning, are a strength. | * Streamlining the process of paying vendors |
| [Managing Capital Assets and Capital Planning](#_Managing_Capital_Assets) | * Central office capacity supports independent towns in tracking capital needs. |  |

### Business Office Staffing and Infrastructure

Key staff in the business office include a full-time director of business administration, two bookkeepers, a grants manager, a payroll specialist, a treasurer/assistant business manager, and one administrative support person at 0.2 full-time equivalents. There also is a director of school facilities and a director of food services at the districts’ central office and at least 1.5 full-time equivalents in each building cafeteria.

According to reports from the central office leaders, the business office has sufficient staff to support daily operations and annual planning. A district leader explained, “We probably have a little bit more staff than some of our neighboring districts. But I think we’re meeting the needs. I think we’re adequately staffed in the business office.” Town officials working with the districts’ business office agree and shared their appreciation for the helpfulness of the business office staff in managing tasks such as staffing and budgeting across multiple entities that in some ways operate as independent districts.

FRSU38 have published guidelines on fiscal management in its comprehensive policy manual. The FRS and Union 38 Student/Family Handbooks file, available on the FRSU38 website, has a link to the Online Policy Manual (p. 10) for the districts with a Fiscal Management section, making this document available to families and the general public. This document provides guidance on the responsibilities of the business office, including budget planning and budget adoption procedures, grants, proposals and special projects, fiscal accounting and reporting, purchasing, procurement requirements, and payment procedures. However, there are no comprehensive written policies and procedures that outline ongoing work to provide continuity to operations due to changes in staffing. This was not raised as a concern. In fact, FRSU38 staff and town officials expressed appreciation for the competency of the director of business administration and staff in the FRSU38 business office.

The districts use the financial management system School ERP Pro (formerly Infinite Visions) to monitor and control resources. FRSU38 officials explained that the system allows for toggling between separate entities, allowing the business office to more easily conduct work on behalf of each district.

Managing the shared finances of four towns and five different districts is a complex task, according to central office staff. Calculating shared costs can be a challenge, exacerbated by the fact that the financial management system does not automatically allocate payments from each district. According to a central office official, “If there is something that’s split five ways for a vendor, we’re going to do five different checks. Accounts payable is entering five separate purchase orders.” To do this, accounts payable staff will determine the numbers for each district on the basis of the cost share percentage. Beyond regular accounting, formal allocations of monies across the five school committees also are a logistical challenge and can add processing time to requests. To give a sense of the work required, a central office official reiterated, “When you say five warrants, that means those are five documents that go to five different elected bodies that have to then make a motion to accept.” Simplifying the financial relationship among the five entities is an area for growth.

Central office staff explained that their system for preserving, categorizing, and, when permissible, destroying financial documents involves a great deal of coordination among the districts. The FRSU38 central office keeps a full set of employee records. A staff member described, “Anything that they fill out upon hire—tax forms . . . applications, transcripts, teacher certifications—all of that’s maintained here. If they’re an hourly employee, we keep their timesheets. Copies are all sent to the town.” Central office leaders also noted that they keep paper records.

Because the districts’ system does not “talk” to the towns’ financial systems to allow easy record sharing, the towns and the central office have separate sets of records. A central office staff member discussed having to reconcile books to make sure each set of records is accurate. The FRSU38 business office does quarterly reconciliations for all funds, including special revenues and grants. Although both the central office and towns maintain sets of records, central office staff expressed uncertainty about which records towns maintain or how. In addition, the structure and relationship among the towns and districts create additional work for all parties. Creating efficiencies around the maintenance of records is an area for growth.

As described by a district leader, the districts’ central office and the towns work together similarly to other districts, but “we just happen to do it four times over.” According to both district leaders and town officials, their interactions are mostly related to budget matters. This includes budget meetings with school boards’ finance committees, budget reconciliations, and closing the books at the end of the year. During budget season, the superintendent and director of business administration present the budget at separate public hearings for each district. According to one town government representative, “The number of meetings that our superintendent has to attend—and finance person—is ridiculous.”

Central office leaders and town officials spoke of the regional agreement for FRSU38. According to a town official, “It’s been around for years . . . and it [was] updated maybe in the 90s or so. It talks about the shared cost—it’s a [five-year] rolling average of so many kids from your town . . . and that’s [each town’s] percentage.” The formula for dividing payments is based on student enrollment on October 1. They went on to say, “There’s a lot of history understood of what each person’s responsibility is, but there isn’t an MOU that I’ve ever seen. . . . Mostly things go on momentum, that this is the way it’s been done.” Some elements of the regional agreement have been updated, such as the superintendent dismissal procedure (see Leadership & Governance). When asked about shared agreements across the elementary districts of U38, a group of town officials described procedures as operating largely within towns, not across towns or districts, except for matters related to Frontier Regional School District. FRSU38 leaders agree that there are no formally written agreements on shared services with the municipalities. However, because the schools are town buildings, the towns provide snow removal for the four elementary schools, but the districts hold the landscaping contract for all schools. Updating the regional agreement is an area of growth for the districts.

FRSU38 staff described their working relationship with officials from all four towns as very positive. Town officials also characterized the working relationship between the districts’ central office and their communities as “very strong, excellent.” One official said, “Whatever we ask them for help with, they’re always there a reasonable amount of time.” Town officials from different towns shared their admiration and appreciation for the superintendent and the director of business administration for their deep knowledge, agility with the budget, and communication across multiple towns and districts. The capacity and competency of the districts’ leadership in maintaining municipal relations are a strength of FRSU38.

Two town officials expressed reservations about the workability of the current multitown arrangement to suit the financial needs and constraints of all of the constituent districts. Multiple respondents raised the idea of a regionalization governance structure to replace the districts’ current governance for financial as well as operational reasons. For example, one participant stated,

I think, long term, we’re going to be having to have real hard discussions about regionalizing at the elementary school level in order to make these schools continue to be effective and to be able to keep the doors open, especially if trends in population continue the way they have.

According to participants, discussions about regionalization have occurred in the past. Several teacher focus group participants, emphasizing the complexities of having different benefits across the four towns, reported supporting regionalization. An official representing one of the smaller towns expressed their frustration that they have less decision-making power, given their size, but feel forced to go along with some collective decisions with which they do not agree. Another official acknowledged the districts’ lack of efficiency at times, stating,

I think [the current organization] works very well. . . . The main issue that everybody recognizes is that we need to regionalize our elementary schools because of cost and [the superintendent and director of business administration] having to go to five meetings a month instead of one when we’re talking about the same thing. It’s just difficult for each town to … have to give up a school. Their elementary school is the lifeblood of the community. It’s where all the children are. It’s where the bake sale is. It is a magnet for people to move into the community. So that’s the challenge. . . . The agreement is very difficult for the administration to function under, but it’s the best we have at the moment.

According to multiple participants, discussions about regionalization have occurred in the past. In fact, the superintendent stated that an attorney would attend the April joint school committee meeting to discuss regionalization, and noted that the topic has been raised in previous years as well.

Other interview and focus group respondents reported that even common structures such as having a uniform CBA still face challenges creating common compensation due to variation and independence of the respective towns. Staff noted that, although the four elementary districts ostensibly have identical teacher contracts, benefits contributions vary across towns (see the Human Resources and Professional Development section). Therefore, if healthcare costs increase, respondents said, it affects teachers in each town differently, given the variation in towns’ resources and contributions to benefit plans. An example noted by another respondent is that if one town is struggling to find qualified teachers, they are bound by a common salary scale but have different levels of resources to support teachers at different levels of that scale. A town official stated that “some real additional friction gets created because the towns are not the same.” The superintendent, also noting that the topic has been raised in the past, stated that an attorney would attend the April, 2025 joint school committee meeting to discuss regionalization.

### Budgeting and Budget Process

According to DESE data, all five districts—FRS and the four elementary districts—exceeded the state’s net school spending requirements in fiscal year 2024. Table 10 provides the state-required net school spending for each of the four elementary school districts and the regional school district. Of the districts included in FRSU38, the difference between what the state required of districts and actual spending is highest at Whately Elementary School, at 115 percent, and lowest at Frontier Regional School, at 45.9 percent.

Table 10. Fiscal Year 2024 Required and Actual Net School Spending for FRSU38

| District | Required net school spending | Actual net school spending | % over |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Conway Grammar | $1,414,438 | $2,400,536 | 69.7 |
| Deerfield Elementary | $4,020,735 | $6,676,615 | 66.1 |
| Sunderland Elementary | $2,451,309 | $4,049,964 | 65.2 |
| Whately Elementary | $1,127,263 | $2,423,298 | 115.0 |
| Frontier Regional | $8,434,576 | $12,306,666 | 45.9 |
| Total | $17,448,321 | $27,857,079 | 72.4 |

Source: DESE Chapter 70 District Profiles.

District budget documents clearly identify funds associated with grants, student activities and organizations, fees, and revolving funds. According to school leaders, the districts’ budget provides appropriate levels of funding for key instructional resources. In fact, school leaders reported that they have always been able to fill needs, such as hiring language teachers.

In fiscal year 2024, the average teacher salary was considerably lower than the state average of $89,576 in all five districts.

Table 11. Fiscal Year 2024 District Average Teacher Salaries

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| District | Average teacher salary |
| Conway Grammar | $71,978 |
| Deerfield Elementary | $74,475 |
| Sunderland Elementary | $71,886 |
| Whately Elementary | $59,451 |
| Frontier Regional | $78,317 |
| State | $91,017 |

Source: [DESE School Finance Dashboard](https://app.powerbigov.us/view?r=eyJrIjoiZmVkOWM4NmMtOGQyYi00ZjY0LTkwZWUtZGQyZGM3YTlhZjgxIiwidCI6IjNlODYxZDE2LTQ4YjctNGEwZS05ODA2LThjMDRkODFiN2IyYSJ9).

Special education placements—of students from within the districts that are members of U38 and from neighboring towns—significantly impact local budgets. FRSU38 leaders do not have direct ability to manage student placements as these happen at the town level. A district central office leader shared an example of the difficulty managing special education expenses:

If you’re in Sunderland and you want to use the . . . early childhood program in Deerfield for students with some behavioral needs, the parent could “school choice” their child there. [And with that placement,] we’re actually “tuitioning” each other within our own district.

Similarly, some municipal officials expressed frustration with the unpredictability of increasing special education costs. Respondents said trying to plan budgets was especially challenging when factors like school choice, which can involve students moving into or outside of the districts and therefore be harder to predict, result in high-percentage changes in smaller districts with smaller budgets. Addressing how special education is organized across districts is an area for growth.

The districts’ leaders described their approach to funding schools as being equitable because teachers are on the same salary schedule and allocations are based on school enrollment. However, a district leader also explained that there are differences among schools: “Staffing composition looks different. Student composition looks different. Family population looks different. Sunderland’s more transient than some of the other communities. Some are more wealthy than others.” Town officials echoed this sentiment, explaining that the towns differ in size and tax base, and therefore come with varying local budget needs, priorities, and abilities to pay into the U38 shared agreement.

Teachers’ association members also interpreted the question about having an equitable budget to be about teacher compensation. In the high school, there are discussions about which responsibilities, such as teaching AP courses, constitute additional responsibilities that qualify for stipends, and these differences, staff said, have been an issue in the contract negotiations.

FRSU38 central office leaders present the budget at school committee meetings and presentations, and the budget timeline is embedded in these presentations. However, detailed budget documents for the five separate entities, including the timeline for the budget process in each district, are not posted on town or school websites. Rather, leaders explained that “copies of the budget are provided to school committees and town officials at school committee meetings and public hearings.” Central office leaders also explained that members of the public can request budget documents, and the business office will provide a paper or digital copy. Creating more transparency regarding the posting of budget documents and the stages of the budget process is an area for growth.

The budget approval process is commonly understood among all partners. Central office leaders, town managers, and school committee members all clearly and similarly explained the annual process**.** The business office begins working on the budget in October by soliciting budget requests and areas for reductions from principals. In turn, principals collect information from their staff and community members. The director of business administration compiles the data from leaders, reviews student enrollment, and evaluates the efficacy of previous investments to create the basis for budget requests**.** District leaders review these requests in December so they can send initial budgets to all five school committees for their review in January. According to district leaders, this first version includes everything on the wish list. In February, district leaders return to the five school committees with revised budgets based on January’s communications. In March, the superintendent and director of business administration present the budget to the select boards and finance committees of the respective towns—10 meetings in all. Public hearings are first and then the school committee votes in a second March meeting. Town meetings to finalize the budgets happen between April and June across the four communities. In these meetings, each town votes for budgets for their local elementary schools and their portion of Frontier Regional School separately. Town officials shared that the select committees generally defer to their school committees. There also is a separate vote if the districts are asking for capital support, whether it is for FRS or one of the town school districts. A strength of the districts is the thoroughness of the budget development process, involving multiple stages of review and feedback from principals, school committees, town officials, and the public.

Town officials expressed concern about the variations in timing of the last stages of the budget review and approval process. According to both central office leaders and town officials, coordinating the timing of budget approvals is concerning, with final approvals happening at the four town meetings from April through June. A town official explained,

If one town later on [in the process] . . . votes down an override that the town needed in order to be able to advance the school budget . . . it’s certainly a concern. And it leaves a lot of uncertainty for both the early [approving] towns and the later [approving] towns, not knowing how things are going to end up.

Another official pointed out that budget approval timing also is difficult for the districts’ central office to have to wait until June to know what the final budget will be when they are hiring staff and planning for the coming year. Aligning the final stages of the budget approval process to limit uncertainty for towns, districts, and central office leadership is an area for growth.

Budget documents indicate that the districts apply for state and federal grants that align with the districts’ strategic plan and that there are systems in place to make sure that grant terms and requirements are followed in a timely manner. The district leaders explained that grants are department based according to what the grant covers. For example, the director of special education is responsible for the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) grant because it is a special education grant; the director of information technology is in charge of a grant to cover cybersecurity; the nurse leader handles anything that is health related; and the directors of education are responsible for curriculum-related grants. The business office, by comparison, is responsible for oversight. Specifically, the grants accountant/manager monitors expenses and will follow up to make sure that funds are coming in, the right expense categories are being charged, the districts are not overriding any rules that allow for flexibility in lines, and all documentation is accurate. Central office staff said managing grants is complicated because of the intersection between the way that the state system for disbursing grants is structured and how some federal funds funnel through Frontier to the elementary schools.

To maintain programs that are grant funded after the funding ends, district officials described planning ahead to have resources available—through the general fund, through other grants, or by asking towns for additional funds. Another way that the districts raise money is by attracting students from other districts into their special education programs. The local districts pay tuition for sending students, providing some flexibility in the districts’ budgets. A central office official described school choice as “each of our district’s free cash.” Also, each of the schools has some level of revolving funds for which the central office has discretion to use. Central office officials said that they have not had budget problems in recent years, but there have been situations in which they must go back to the town to request additional funds for a capital expense (e.g., replacing a water heater).

According to the districts’ central office staff, the districts face many uncertainties related to the school choice program, stating, “We do talk about school choice enrollment a lot at all five districts because we rely on that money to keep our general fund lower because our towns have to fund the general fund.” As a result, multiyear financial planning is difficult. However, officials are aware of the potential swings in enrollment and discuss the implications of these changes.

The more concrete discussions about changes in district enrollment are about prekindergarten and kindergarten, as enrollment in the older elementary grades is more consistent. FRSU38 also plan for what the enrollment numbers will look like at Frontier Regional School on the basis of the rising sixth-grade students and how the numbers could change again in ninth grade as some students choose schools outside of the districts.

An additional variable affecting the budget is teacher compensation. There are currently ongoing contract negotiations, so central office and district leaders create various budget projection models to assess the potential impact. For the most part, however, the districts’ officials use enrollment data and information about grants to inform their budgets—but they do not go further than that. When asked about consideration for specific needs, a district official explained, “There isn’t much diversity in the district, so equity data isn’t used to inform budget decisions.”

There is evidence, from central office leaders and school committee meeting minutes, that FRSU38 central office staff provide budget updates to each school committee on a regular basis. A district leader reported, “Expense reports year-to-date are shared with school committee at each meeting. And [the director of business administration talks] publicly in meetings, which are recorded. They’re live streamed as well.” In addition, the districts hire an independent financial auditing service each year. Provided reports on FRS dating to 2021 show no findings related to internal controls, management of federal funds, or overall financial risk.

### Operations

According to FRSU38 central office leaders, each district is responsible for student transportation for the general population, but the director of special education for the districts is responsible for the transportation of students with identified needs. For just one contract for bus service to be maintained, the invitation for bid is structured so that vendors bid on all five districts as a package. Central office leaders reported that “there are no rules or guidelines for students and families in regard to transportation.” A bus schedule for each school is available on the FRSU38 website at the beginning of each school year.Someinterview and focus group participants from smaller communities expressed frustration that some state rules do not allow more flexibility for smaller, rural communities.

The districts’ director of food services oversees nutrition services. The FRSU38 website provides information on food services. The districts’ food services mission is to “offer balanced, nutritious meals for all students, promote overall health, academic success and educate students to make optimal food choices for life.” The site also states, “All lunches for the 2023-2024 School Year will be free to all Frontier Regional/Union#38 Students.” When asked, high school students identified the lunch as something they would like to change. One student shared, “It would be nice if the lunch got some more funding. . . . To their credit, the lunch crew actually do really well for the money and the resources they’re given. Obviously, the students would like it to be a bit better, but that’s not really their fault.” Neither middle school students nor parents addressed the quality of the food provided.

FRSU38 provide their students and staff with the hardware, software, and related licenses and support for everyday learning and daily operations. FRSU38 schools support providing a Chromebook for each student in Grades PK-12. All devices have been distributed to all the schools. All students will have access to their own FRSU38–issued device for appropriate and equitable access to any form of remote learning. Each district-managed Chromebook includes Internet activity monitoring and content filtering as well as access to G Suite for education tools, productivity software (Docs, Sheets, Slides, Drawings, Forms, etc.), communication tools (Gmail, Meet, Hangouts, Big Blue Button), learning management systems (Google Classroom, Schoology), cloud storage (Google Drive), and all required learning software. In addition, the district website hosts the Frontier Regional/Union#38 Schools Family Tech Center with technology-related resources for students. A teacher representative described the districts’ technology program with enthusiasm, stating, “I think we‘re a pretty technologically rich district. I think we‘re really fortunate.” Access to technology and related support is a strength of the districts.

Central office leaders explained that the districts have an established process for purchasing supplies and services in alignment with state laws and effectively manage those contracts with vendors. Their process includes working directly with school principals, but town officials are not involved in the details. Town officials agree with this and explained that the districts take the lead in managing and executing contracts with vendors. Both district leaders and town officials explained how the districts share specific costs. Much like how the central office allocates costs to each district for central office staff, such as the superintendent and other directors, it does the same for certain shared purchases and contracts. A central office staff member explained that “even things like software, PowerSchool, our data management system, ParentSquare . . . are all split based on cost sharing [based on] enrollment.” For shared platforms or services, vendor payments are divided among the five districts. A district leader provided an example: “We contract with one vendor for our student information system platform. The invoice is divided up and paid by each district.” This payment system can be problematic because “vendors want to run through one primary point of contact rather than getting five separate checks.” Streamlining this process of paying vendors is an area for growth.

### Managing Capital Assets and Capital Planning

FRSU38 does not have a formal single capital plan, nor do the individual districts have their own formal long-term capital plans. Still, FRSU38 central office staff explained that their director of school facilities has worked with principals in all schools to identify and track potential capital needs. The director of school facilities keeps detailed records of capital needs and makes them accessible to all constituent school districts and member towns. Staff said these the director created priorities based on future enrollment projections and facility assessments. As a result of this tracking, all schools have a “capital list” that includes a list of need projects by priority, projected costs, notes on funding sources, and dates on when each need was requested and when funded.

It is often the case that minor expenses can be absorbed in existing budgets. However, most major capital expenses are funded through warrant items at town meetings for approval, though Frontier has used school choice funding most recently to fund a capital project. Similarly, one municipal official explained that when there is an unexpected capital need, the town would vote to approve the expense and find the money to cover the expense. The use of central office capacity to support independent towns in tracking capital needs is a strength of the districts.

To create these capital lists, the director of school facilities will work with the principals on their priorities and make sure that nothing is missed. The director of school facilities shares the needs with the superintendent and the director of business administration, and they put the plan together and present it to each school committee. Each of the elementary schools has a school committee member who sits on their town’s capital committee providing school input. A district leader explained,

We try to have a pulse on . . . you know, major projects. Is the boiler 30 years old and it’s coming up for replacement in the next few years? When’s the roof due? There are also small things like classroom flooring, cafeteria tables, those kinds of things. We try to have good communication with the towns about what’s coming up for capital expenses.

FRSU38 district leaders described how each capital plan is funded differently in the different districts. Conway Grammar has a capital stabilization fund, whereas other elementary schools use individual warrant articles for capital expenses and the town must raise or appropriate funds. FRS has a subcommittee for capital planning composed of one school committee member from each of the four towns to represent the four towns and then also a select board member from each of the four towns. The director of business administration, the director of school facilities, and the superintendent all sit on FRS’s capital subcommittee. It is often the case that FRS is able to use funds left over from previous fiscal years to support capital projects.

### DESE Recommendations

* *The districts should explore opportunities to simplify the financial management of five entities, including (but not limited to) regionalization.*
* *The districts should consider ways to streamline their records management systems to support appropriate information-sharing and limit unnecessary duplication.*
* *The districts should initiate the process of updating their regional agreement.*
* *The districts should explore their options for centralizing and streamlining the process of placing students with disabilities in the most supportive placements available.*
* *The districts should post detailed and accessible budget documents on their website.*
* *The districts should work with their respective towns and with each other to identify opportunities for alignment around the timing for budget approval.*
* *The districts should explore whether there are opportunities to simplify their vendor payment processes.*

## Appendix A. Summary of Site Visit Activities

The AIR team completed the following as part of the district review activities in FRSU38 (specifically, Conway Grammar, Deerfield Elementary, Sunderland Elementary, Whately Elementary, and Frontier Regional). The team conducted 63 classroom observations during the week of March 3, 2025, and held interviews and focus groups between March 3 and March 7. The site visit team conducted interviews and focus groups with the following representatives from the schools and the districts:

* Superintendent
* Other central office leaders
* School committee members from regional and town school committees
* Teachers’ association leaders from both associations
* Principals
* Teachers from all schools
* Support specialists
* Parents
* Students
* Town government representatives from all four towns

The review team analyzed multiple datasets and reviewed numerous documents before and during the site visit, including the following:

* Student and school performance data, including achievement and growth, enrollment, graduation, dropout, retention, suspension, and attendance rates
* Data on the districts’ staffing and finances
* Curricular review process and timeline
* FRSU38 curriculum unit template
* Published educational reports on the districts by DESE, the New England Association of Schools and Colleges, and the former Office of Educational Quality and Accountability
* District documents such as district improvement plans and SIPs, school committee policies, curriculum documents, summaries of student assessments, job descriptions, CBAs, evaluation tools for staff, handbooks, school schedules, and the districts’ end-of-year financial reports
* All completed program and administrator evaluations and a random selection of completed teacher evaluations
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Introduction

The *Districtwide Instructional Observation Report* presents ratings for the classroom observations that were conducted by certified observers at American Institutes for Research (AIR) as part of the Massachusetts District Reviews.

Three observers visited Frontier Regional and Union 38 schools during the week of March 3, 2025. Observers conducted 63 observations in a sample of classrooms across five schools. Observations were conducted in grades K-12 and focused primarily on literacy, English language arts, and mathematics instruction.

The classroom observations were guided by the Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS), developed by the Center for Advanced Study of Teaching and Learning (CASTL) at the University of Virginia. Three levels of CLASS Manuals were used: K–3, Upper Elementary, and Secondary. The K–3 tool was used to observe grades K–3, the Upper Elementary tool was used to observe grades 4–5, and the Secondary tool was used to observe grades 6–12.

The K–3 protocol includes 10 classroom dimensions related to three domains: Emotional Support, Classroom Organization, and Instructional Support (listed in Table 1).

Table 1. CLASS K–3 Domains and Dimensions

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Emotional Support | Classroom Organization | Instructional Support |
| * Positive Climate * Negative Climate * Teacher Sensitivity * Regard for Student Perspectives | * Behavior Management * Productivity * Instructional Learning Formats | * Concept Development * Quality of Feedback * Language Modeling |

The Upper Elementary and Secondary protocols include 11 classroom dimensions related to three domains: Emotional Support, Classroom Organization, and Instructional Support (listed in Table 2), in addition to Student Engagement.

Table 2. CLASS Upper Elementary and Secondary Domains and Dimensions

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Emotional Support | Classroom Organization | Instructional Support |
| * Positive Climate * Teacher Sensitivity * Regard for Student Perspectives | * Behavior Management * Productivity * Negative Climate | * Instructional Learning Formats * Content Understanding * Analysis and Inquiry * Quality of Feedback * Instructional Dialogue |
|  | Student Engagement |  |

When conducting a visit to a classroom, the observer rates each dimension (including Student Engagement) on a scale of 1 to 7. A rating of 1 or 2 indicates that the dimension was never or rarely evident during the visit. For example, a rating of 1 or 2 on Teacher Sensitivity indicates that, at the time of the visit, the teacher was not aware of students who needed extra support or attention, was unresponsive to or dismissive of students, or was ineffective at addressing students’ problems; as a result, students rarely sought support from the teacher or communicated openly with the teacher. A rating of 3, 4, or 5 indicates that the dimension was evident but not exhibited consistently or in a way that included all students. A rating of 6 or 7 indicates that the dimension was reflected in all or most classroom activities and in a way that included all or most students.

Members of the observation team who visited the classrooms all received training on the CLASS protocol and then passed a rigorous certification exam for each CLASS protocol to ensure that they were able to accurately rate the dimensions. All observers must pass an exam annually to maintain their certification.

Research on CLASS protocol shows that students in classrooms that rated high using this observation tool have greater gains in social skills and academic success than students in classrooms with lower ratings (MET Project, 2010; CASTL, n.d.). Furthermore, small improvements on these domains can affect student outcomes: “The ability to demonstrate even small changes in effective interactions has practical implications—differences in just over 1 point on the CLASS 7-point scale translate into improved achievement and social skill development for students” (CASTL, n.d., p. 3).

In this report, each CLASS dimension is defined, and descriptions of the dimensions at the high (6 or 7), middle (3, 4, or 5), and low levels (1 or 2) are presented *(definitions and rating descriptions are derived from the CLASS K–3*, *Upper Elementary, and Secondary Manuals).* For each dimension we indicate the frequency of classroom observations across the ratings and provide a districtwide average of the observed classrooms. In cases where a dimension is included in more than one CLASS manual level, those results are combined on the dimension-specific pages. In the summary of ratings table following the dimension-specific pages the averages for every dimension are presented by grade band (K-5, 6-8, and 9-12). For each dimension, we indicate the grade levels for which this dimension is included.

Positive Climate

Emotional Support domain, Grades K−12

Positive Climate reflects the emotional connection between the teacher and students and among students and the warmth, respect, and enjoyment communicated by verbal and nonverbal interactions (*CLASS K–3 Manual*, p. 23, *CLASS Upper Elementary Manual,* p. 21, *CLASS Secondary Manual*, p. 21). Table 3 (as well as tables for the remaining dimensions) includes the number of classrooms for each rating on each dimension and the district average for that dimension.

Table 3. Positive Climate: Number of Classrooms for Each Rating and District Average

Positive Climate District Average\*: 5.1

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | Low Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | High Range | High Range | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 63 | 5.1 |
| Grades K-5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 13 | 5 | 6 | 29 | 5.4 |
| Grades 6-8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 2 | 14 | 5.6 |
| Grades 9-12 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 6 | 4 | 0 | 20 | 4.4 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 3, the district average is computed as:   
([2 x 2] + [3 x 4] + [4 x 11] + [5 x 22] + [6 x 16] + [7 x 8]) ÷ 63 observations = 5.1

Ratings in the Low Range. All indicators are absent or only minimally present. Teachers and students do not appear to share a warm, supportive relationship. Interpersonal connections are not evident or only minimally evident. Affect in the classroom is flat, and there are rarely instances of teachers and students smiling, sharing humor, or laughing together. There are no, or very few, positive communications among the teacher and students; the teacher does not communicate encouragement. There is no evidence that students and the teacher respect one another or that the teacher encourages students to respect one another.

Ratings in the Middle Range. There are some indications that the teacher and students share a warm and supportive relationship, but some students may be excluded from this relationship, either by the teacher or the students. Some relationships appear constrained—for example, the teacher expresses a perfunctory interest in students, or encouragement seems to be an automatic statement and is not sincere. Sometimes, teachers and students demonstrate respect for one another.

Ratings in the High Range. There are many indications that the relationship among students and the teacher is positive and warm. The teacher is typically in close proximity to students, and encouragement is sincere and personal. There are frequent displays of shared laughter, smiles, and enthusiasm. Teachers and students show respect for one another (e.g., listening, using calm voices, using polite language). Positive communication (both verbal and nonverbal) and mutual respect are evident throughout the session.

Teacher Sensitivity

Emotional Support domain, Grades K−12

Teacher Sensitivity encompasses the teacher’s awareness of and responsiveness to students’ academic and emotional needs. High levels of sensitivity facilitate students’ abilities to actively explore and learn because the teacher consistently provides comfort, reassurance, and encouragement (*CLASS K–3 Manual,* p. 32, *CLASS Upper Elementary Manual,* p. 27, *CLASS Secondary Manual,* p. 27).

Table 4. Teacher Sensitivity: Number of Classrooms for Each Rating and District Average

Teacher Sensitivity District Average\*: 5.5

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | Low Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | High Range | High Range | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 63 | 5.5 |
| Grades K-5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 16 | 6 | 29 | 5.9 |
| Grades 6-8 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 6 | 14 | 6.0 |
| Grades 9-12 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 10 | 2 | 0 | 20 | 4.5 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 4, the district average is computed as:   
([2 x 1] + [3 x 3] + [4 x 8] + [5 x 16] + [6 x 23] + [7 x 12]) ÷ 63 observations = 5.5

Ratings in the Low Range. In these sessions, the teacher has not been aware of students who need extra support and pays little attention to students’ needs. As a result, students are frustrated, confused, and disengaged. The teacher is unresponsive to and dismissive of students and may ignore students, squash their enthusiasm, and not allow them to share their moods or feelings. The teacher is not effective in addressing students’ needs and does not appropriately acknowledge situations that may be upsetting to students. Students rarely seek support from the teacher and minimize conversations with the teacher, not sharing ideas or responding to questions.

Ratings in the Middle Range. The teacher is sometimes aware of student needs or aware of only a limited type of student needs, such as academic needs, not social-emotional needs. Or the teacher may be aware of some students and not of other students. The teacher does not always realize a student is confused and needs extra help or when a student already knows the material being taught. The teacher may be responsive at times to students but at other times may ignore or dismiss students. The teacher may respond only to students who are upbeat and positive and not support students who are upset. Sometimes, the teacher is effective in addressing students’ concerns or problems, but not always.

Ratings in the High Range. The teacher’s awareness of students and their needs is consistent and accurate. The teacher may predict how difficult a new task is for a student and acknowledge this difficulty. The teacher is responsive to students’ comments and behaviors, whether positive or negative. The teacher consistently addresses students’ problems and concerns and is effective in doing so. Students are obviously comfortable with the teacher and share ideas, work comfortably together, and ask and respond to questions, even difficult questions.

Regard for Student Perspectives

Emotional Support domain, Grades K−12

Regard for Student Perspectives captures the degree to which the teacher’s interactions with students and classroom activities place an emphasis on students’ interests, motivations, and points of view and encourage student responsibility and autonomy (*CLASS K–3 Manual,* p. 38, *CLASS Upper Elementary Manual,* p. 35, *CLASS Secondary Manual*, p. 35).

Table 5. Regard for Student Perspectives: Number of Classrooms for Each Rating and District Average

Regard for Student Perspectives District Average\*: 3.6

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | Low Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | High Range | High Range | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 63 | 3.6 |
| Grades K-5 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 8 | 10 | 2 | 0 | 29 | 4.1 |
| Grades 6-8 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 3.4 |
| Grades 9-12 | 0 | 8 | 8 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 2.9 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 5, the district average is computed as:   
([2 x 10] + [3 x 24] + [4 x 13] + [5 x 14] + [6 x 2]) ÷ 63 observations = 3.6

Ratings in the Low Range. At the low range, the teacher exhibits an inflexible, rigid adherence to his or her plan, without considering student ideas or allowing students to make contributions. The teacher inhibits student enthusiasm by imposing guidelines or making remarks that inhibit student expression. The teacher may rigidly adhere to a lesson plan and not respond to student interests. The teacher does not allow students any autonomy on how they conduct an activity, may control materials tightly, and may offer few opportunities for students to help out with classroom responsibilities. There are few opportunities for students to talk and express themselves.

Ratings in the Middle Range. The teacher exhibits control at times and at other times follows the students’ lead and gives them some choices and opportunities to follow their interests. There are some opportunities for students to exercise autonomy, but student choice is limited. The teacher may assign students responsibility in the classroom, but in a limited way. At times, the teacher dominates the discussion, but at other times the teacher allows students to share ideas, although only at a minimal level or for a short period of time.

Ratings in the High Range. The teacher is flexible in following student leads, interests, and ideas and looks for ways to meaningfully engage students. Although the teacher has a lesson plan, students’ ideas are incorporated into the lesson plan. The teacher consistently supports student autonomy and provides meaningful leadership opportunities. Students have frequent opportunities to talk, share ideas, and work together. Students have appropriate freedom of movement during activities.

Negative Climate

Emotional Support domain, Grades K− 3  
Classroom Organization domain, Grades 4− 12

Negative Climate reflects the overall level of expressed negativity in the classroom. The frequency, quality, and intensity of teacher and student negativity are key to this dimension (*CLASS K–3 Manual*, p. 28, *CLASS Upper Elementary Manual,* p. 55, *CLASS Secondary Manual,* p. 55). For the purposes of this report, we have inversed the observers scores, to be consistent with the range scores across all dimensions. Therefore, a high range score in this dimension indicates an absence of negative climate, and a low range score indicates the presence of negative climate.[[5]](#footnote-6)

Table 6. Negative Climate: Number of Classrooms for Each Rating and District Average

Negative Climate District Average\*: 6.9

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | Low Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | High Range | High Range | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 63 | 6.9 |
| Grades K-5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 29 | 6.9 |
| Grades 6-8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 13 | 14 | 6.9 |
| Grades 9-12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 18 | 20 | 6.9 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 6, the district average is computed as:   
([3 x 1] + [6 x 3] + [7 x 59]) ÷ 63 observations = 6.9

Ratings in the Low Range.Negativity is pervasive. The teacher may express constant irritation, annoyance, or anger; unduly criticize students; or consistently use a harsh tone and/or take a harsh stance as he or she interacts with students. Threats or yelling are frequently used to establish control. Language is disrespectful and sarcastic. Severe negativity, such as the following actions, would lead to a high rating on negative climate, even if the action is not extended: students bullying one another, a teacher hitting a student, or students physically fighting with one another.

Ratings in the Middle Range. There are some expressions of mild negativity by the teacher or students. The teacher may express irritability, use a harsh tone, and/or express annoyance—usually during difficult moments in the classroom. Threats or yelling may be used to establish control over the classroom, but not constantly; they are used more as a response to situations. At times, the teacher and students may be sarcastic or disrespectful toward one another.

Ratings in the High Range. There is no display of negativity: No strong expressions of anger or aggression are exhibited, either by the teacher or students; if there is such a display, it is contained and does not escalate. The teacher does not issue threats or yell to establish control. The teacher and students are respectful and do not express sarcasm.

Behavior Management

Classroom Organization domain, Grades K−12

Behavior Management refers to the teacher’s ability to provide clear behavioral expectations and use effective methods to prevent and redirect misbehavior (*CLASS K–3 Manual*, p. 45, *CLASS Upper Elementary Manual,* p. 41, *CLASS Secondary Manual*, p. 41).

Table 7. Behavior Management: Number of Classrooms for Each Rating and District Average

Behavior Management District Average\*: 7.0

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | Low Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | High Range | High Range | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 63 | 7.0 |
| Grades K-5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 28 | 29 | 6.9 |
| Grades 6-8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 14 | 7.0 |
| Grades 9-12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 19 | 20 | 7.0 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 7, the district average is computed as:   
([5 x 1] + [6 x 1] + [7 x 61]) ÷ 63 observations = 7.0

Ratings in the Low Range. At the low range, the classroom is chaotic. There are no rules and expectations, or they are not enforced consistently. The teacher does not monitor the classroom effectively and only reacts to student disruption, which is frequent. There are frequent instances of misbehavior in the classroom, and the teacher’s attempts to redirect misbehavior are ineffective. The teacher does not use cues, such as eye contact, slight touches, gestures, or physical proximity, to respond to and redirect negative behavior.

Ratings in the Middle Range. Although rules and expectations may be stated, they are not consistently enforced, or the rules may be unclear. Sometimes, the teacher proactively anticipates and prevents misbehavior, but at other times the teacher ignores behavior problems until it is too late. Misbehavior may escalate because redirection is not always effective. Episodes of misbehavior are periodic.

Ratings in the High Range. At the high range, the rules and guidelines for behavior are clear, and they are consistently reinforced by the teacher. The teacher monitors the classroom and prevents problems from developing, using subtle cues to redirect behavior and address situations before they escalate. The teacher focuses on positive behavior and consistently affirms students’ desirable behaviors. The teacher effectively uses cues to redirect behavior. There are no, or very few, instances of student misbehavior or disruptions.

Productivity

Classroom Organization domain, Grades K−12

Productivity considers how well the teacher manages instructional time and routines and provides activities for students so that they have the opportunity to be involved in learning activities (*CLASS K–3 Manual,* p. 51, *CLASS Upper Elementary Manual,* p. 49, *CLASS Secondary Manual*, p. 49).

Table 8. Productivity: Number of Classrooms for Each Rating and District Average

Productivity District Average\*: 6.8

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | Low Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | High Range | High Range | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 63 | 6.8 |
| Grades K-5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 27 | 29 | 6.9 |
| Grades 6-8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 13 | 14 | 6.9 |
| Grades 9-12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 17 | 20 | 6.7 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 8, the district average is computed as:   
([5 x 4] + [6 x 2] + [7 x 57]) ÷ 63 observations = 6.8

Ratings in the Low Range. At the low level, the teacher provides few activities for students. Much time is spent on managerial tasks (such as distributing papers) and/or on behavior management. Frequently during the observation, students have little to do and spend time waiting. The routines of the classroom are not clear and, as a result, students waste time, are not engaged, and are confused. Transitions take a long time and/or are too frequent. The teacher does not have activities organized and ready and seems to be caught up in last-minute preparations.

Ratings in the Middle Range. At the middle range, the teacher does provide activities for students but loses learning time to disruptions or management tasks. There are certain times when the teacher provides clear activities to students, but there are other times when students wait and lose focus. Some students (or all students, at some point) do not know what is expected of them. Some of the transitions may take too long, or classrooms may be productive during certain periods but then not productive during transitions. Although the teacher is mostly prepared for the class, last-minute preparations may still infringe on learning time.

Ratings in the High Range. The classroom runs very smoothly. The teacher provides a steady flow of activities for students, so students do not have downtime and are not confused about what to do next. The routines of the classroom are efficient, and all students know how to move from one activity to another and where materials are. Students understand the teacher’s instructions and directions. Transitions are quick, and there are not too many of them. The teacher is fully prepared for the lesson.

Instructional Learning Formats

Classroom Organization domain, Grades K−3

Instructional Support domain, Grades 4− 12

Instructional Learning Formats refer to the ways in which the teacher maximizes students’ interest, engagement, and abilities to learn from the lesson and activities (*CLASS K–3 Manual*, p. 57; *CLASS Upper Elementary Manual*, p. 63, *CLASS Secondary Manual,* p. 61).

Table 9. Instructional Learning Formats: Number of Classrooms for Each Rating and District Average

Instructional Learning Formats District Average\*: 5.2

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | Low Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | High Range | High Range | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 63 | 5.2 |
| Grades K-5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 17 | 3 | 29 | 5.7 |
| Grades 6-8 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 14 | 5.5 |
| Grades 9-12 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 11 | 1 | 0 | 20 | 4.4 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 9, the district average is computed as:   
([3 x 6] + [4 x 7] + [5 x 22] + [6 x 22] + [7 x 6]) ÷ 63 observations = 5.2

Ratings in the Low Range. The teacher exerts little effort in facilitating engagement in the lesson. Learning activities may be limited and seem to be at the rote level, with little teacher involvement. The teacher relies on one learning modality (e.g., listening) and does not use other modalities (e.g., movement, visual displays) to convey information and enhance learning. Or the teacher may be ineffective in using other modalities, not choosing the right props for the students or the classroom conditions. Students are uninterested and uninvolved in the lesson. The teacher does not attempt to guide students toward learning objectives and does not help them focus on the lesson by providing appropriate tools and asking effective questions.

Ratings in the Middle Range. At the middle range, the teacher sometimes facilitates engagement in the lesson but at other times does not, or the teacher facilitates engagement for some students and not for other students. The teacher may not allow students enough time to explore or answer questions. Sometimes, the teacher uses a variety of modalities to help students reach a learning objective, but at other times the teacher does not. Student engagement is inconsistent, or some students are engaged and other students are not. At times, students are aware of the learning objective and at other times they are not. The teacher may sometimes use strategies to help students organize information but at other times does not.

Ratings in the High Range.The teacher has multiple strategies and tools to facilitate engagement and learning and encourage participation. The teacher may move around, talk and play with students, ask open-ended questions of students, and allow students to explore. A variety of tools and props are used, including movement and visual/auditory resources. Students are consistently interested and engaged in the activities and lessons. The teacher focuses students on the learning objectives, which students understand. The teacher uses advanced organizers to prepare students for an activity, as well as reorientation strategies that help students regain focus.

Concept Development

Instructional Support domain, Grades K−3

Concept Development refers to the teacher’s use of instructional discussions and activities to promote students’ higher order thinking skills and cognition and the teacher’s focus on understanding rather than on rote instruction (*CLASS K–3 Manual*, p. 64).

Table 10. Concept Development: Number of Classrooms for Each Rating and District Average

Concept Development District Average\*: 3.8

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | Low Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | High Range | High Range | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 19 | 3.8 |
| Grades K-3\*\* | 1 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 19 | 3.8 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 10, the district average is computed as:   
([1 x 1] + [2 x 3] + [3 x 5] + [4 x 1] + [5 x 7] + [6 x 2]) ÷ 19 observations = 3.8

\*\*Concept Development does not appear in the CLASS Upper Elementary Manual, therefore scores for the Elementary School Level represent grades K-3 only.

Ratings in the Low Range. At the low range, the teacher does not attempt to develop students’ understanding of ideas and concepts, focusing instead on basic facts and skills. Discussion and activities do not encourage students to analyze and reason. There are few, if any, opportunities for students to create or generate ideas and products. The teacher does not link concepts to one another and does not ask students to make connections with previous content or their actual lives. The activities and the discussion are removed from students’ lives and from their prior knowledge.

Ratings in the Middle Range. To some extent, the teacher uses discussions and activities to encourage students to analyze and reason and focuses somewhat on understanding of ideas. The activities and discussions are not fully developed, however, and there is still instructional time that focuses on facts and basic skills. Students may be provided some opportunities for creating and generating ideas, but the opportunities are occasional and not planned out. Although some concepts may be linked and also related to students’ previous learning, such efforts are brief. The teacher makes some effort to relate concepts to students’ lives but does not elaborate enough to make the relationship meaningful to students.

Ratings in the High Range. At the high range, the teacher frequently guides students to analyze and reason during discussions and activities. Most of the questions are open ended and encourage students to think about connections and implications. Teachers use problem solving, experimentation, and prediction; comparison and classification; and evaluation and summarizing to promote analysis and reasoning. The teacher provides students with opportunities to be creative and generate ideas. The teacher consistently links concepts to one another and to previous learning and relates concepts to students’ lives.

Content Understanding

Instructional Support domain, Grades 4− 12

Content Understanding refers to the depth of lesson content and the approaches used to help students comprehend the framework, key ideas, and procedures in an academic discipline. At a high level, this dimension refers to interactions among the teacher and students that lead to an integrated understanding of facts, skills, concepts, and principles (*CLASS Upper Elementary Manual*, p. 70, *CLASS Secondary Manual,* p. 68).

Table 11. Content Understanding: Number of Classrooms for Each Rating and District Average

Content Understanding District Average\*: 4.1

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | Low Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | High Range | High Range | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 44 | 4.1 |
| Grades 4-5\*\* | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 10 | 4.1 |
| Grades 6-8 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 14 | 4.7 |
| Grades 9-12 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 9 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 3.7 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 11, the district average is computed as:   
([1 x 1] + [2 x 2] + [3 x 9] + [4 x 17] + [5 x 10] + [6 x 5]) ÷ 44 observations = 4.1

\*\*Content Understanding does not appear in the CLASS K-3 Manual, therefore scores for the Elementary School Level represent grades 4-5 only.

Ratings in the Low Range. At the low range, the focus of the class is primarily on presenting discrete pieces of topically related information, absent broad, organizing ideas. The discussion and materials fail to effectively communicate the essential attributes of the concepts and procedures to students. The teacher makes little effort to elicit or acknowledge students’ background knowledge or misconceptions or to integrate previously learned material when presenting new information.

Ratings in the Middle Range. At the middle range, the focus of the class is sometimes on meaningful discussion and explanation of broad, organizing ideas. At other times, the focus is on discrete pieces of information. Class discussion and materials communicate some of the essential attributes of concepts and procedures, but examples are limited in scope or not consistently provided. The teacher makes some attempt to elicit and/or acknowledge students’ background knowledge or misconceptions and/or to integrate information with previously learned materials; however, these moments are limited in depth or inconsistent.

Ratings in the High Range. At the high range, the focus of the class is on encouraging deep understanding of content through the provision of meaningful, interactive discussion and explanation of broad, organizing ideas. Class discussion and materials consistently communicate the essential attributes of concepts and procedures to students. New concepts and procedures and broad ideas are consistently linked to students’ prior knowledge in ways that advance their understanding and clarify misconceptions.

Analysis and Inquiry

Instructional Support domain, Grades 4− 12

Analysis and Inquiry assesses the degree to which students are engaged in higher level thinking skills through their application of knowledge and skills to novel and/or open-ended problems, tasks, and questions. Opportunities for engaging in metacognition (thinking about thinking) also are included (*CLASS Upper Elementary Manual*, p. 81, *CLASS Secondary Manual*, p. 76).

Table 12. Analysis and Inquiry: Number of Classrooms for Each Rating and District Average

Analysis and Inquiry District Average\*: 2.3

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | Low Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | High Range | High Range | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 44 | 2.3 |
| Grades 4-5\*\* | 4 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 2.3 |
| Grades 6-8 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 2.5 |
| Grades 9-12 | 8 | 3 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 2.3 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 12, the district average is computed as:   
([1 x 15] + [2 x 10] + [3 x 10] + [4 x 7] + [5 x 2]) ÷ 44 observations = 2.3

\*\*Analysis and Inquiry does not appear in the CLASS K-3 Manual, therefore scores for the Elementary School Level represent grades 4-5 only.

Ratings in the Low Range. At the low range, students do not engage in higher order thinking skills. Instruction is presented in a rote manner, and there are no opportunities for students to engage in novel or open-ended tasks. Students are not challenged to apply previous knowledge and skills to a new problem, nor are they encouraged to think about, evaluate, or reflect on their own learning. Students do not have opportunities to plan their own learning experiences.

Ratings in the Middle Range. Students occasionally engage in higher order thinking through analysis and inquiry, but the episodes are brief or limited in depth. The teacher provides opportunities for students to apply knowledge and skills within familiar contexts and offers guidance to students but does not provide opportunities for analysis and problem solving within novel contexts and/or without teacher support. Students have occasional opportunities to think about their own thinking through explanations, self-evaluations, reflection, and planning; these opportunities, however, are brief and limited in depth.

Ratings in the High Range. At the high range, students consistently engage in extended opportunities to use higher order thinking through analysis and inquiry. The teacher provides opportunities for students to independently solve or reason through novel and open-ended tasks that require students to select, utilize, and apply existing knowledge and skills. Students have multiple opportunities to think about their own thinking through explanations, self-evaluations, reflection, and planning.

Quality of Feedback

Instructional Support domain, Grades K− 12

Quality of Feedback refers to the degree to which the teacher provides feedback that expands learning and understanding and encourages continued participation in the learning activity (*CLASS K–3 Manual*, p. 72). In the upper elementary and secondary classrooms, significant feedback also may be provided by peers (*CLASS Upper Elementary Manual*, p. 89, *CLASS Secondary Manual*, p. 93). Regardless of the source, the focus of the feedback motivates learning.

Table 13. Quality of Feedback: Number of Classrooms for Each Rating and District Average

Quality of Feedback District Average\*: 3.5

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | Low Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | High Range | High Range | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 63 | 3.5 |
| Grades K-5 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 7 | 9 | 3 | 0 | 29 | 4.0 |
| Grades 6-8 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 14 | 3.2 |
| Grades 9-12 | 2 | 4 | 9 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 2.9 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 13, the district average is computed as:   
([1 x 6] + [2 x 8] + [3 x 19] + [4 x 15] + [5 x 10] + [6 x 4] + [7 x 1]) ÷ 63 observations = 3.5

Ratings in the Low Range. At the low range, the teacher dismisses incorrect responses or misperceptions and rarely scaffolds student learning. The teacher is more interested in students providing the correct answer than understanding. Feedback is perfunctory. The teacher may not provide opportunities to learn whether students understand or are interested. The teacher rarely questions students or asks them to explain their thinking and reasons for their responses. The teacher does not or rarely provides information that might expand student understanding and rarely offers encouragement that increases student effort and persistence.

Ratings in the Middle Range. In the middle range, the teacher sometimes scaffolds students, but this is not consistent. On occasion, the teacher facilitates feedback loops so that students may elaborate and expand on their thinking, but these moments are not sustained long enough to accomplish a learning objective. Sometimes, the teacher asks students about or prompts them to explain their thinking and provides information to help students understand, but sometimes the feedback is perfunctory. At times, the teacher encourages student efforts and persistence.

Ratings in the High Range. In this range, the teacher frequently scaffolds students who are having difficulty, providing hints or assistance as needed. The teacher engages students in feedback loops to help them understand ideas or reach the right response. The teacher often questions students, encourages them to explain their thinking, and provides additional information that may help students understand. The teacher regularly encourages students’ efforts and persistence.

Language Modeling

Instructional Support domain, Grades K− 3

Language Modeling refers to the quality and amount of the teacher’s use of language stimulation and language facilitation techniques (*CLASS K–3 Manual*, p. 79).

Table 14. Language Modeling: Number of Classrooms for Each Rating and District Average

Language Modeling District Average\*: 3.9

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | Low Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | High Range | High Range | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 19 | 3.9 |
| Grades K-3\*\* | 1 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 19 | 3.9 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 14, the district average is computed as:   
([1 x 1] + [2 x 4] + [3 x 2] + [4 x 4] + [5 x 5] + [6 x 3]) ÷ 19 observations = 3.9

\*\*Language Modeling does not appear in the CLASS Upper Elementary Manual, therefore scores for the Elementary School Level represent grades K-3 only.

Ratings in the Low Range. In the low range, there are few conversations in the classroom, particularly between the students and the teacher. The teacher responds to students’ initiating talk with only a few words, limits students’ use of language (in responding to questions) and asks questions that mainly elicit closed-ended responses. The teacher does not or rarely extends students’ responses or repeats them for clarification. The teacher does not engage in self-talk or parallel talk—explaining what he or she or the students are doing. The teacher does not use new words or advanced language with students. The language used has little variety.

Ratings in the Middle Range. In this range, the teacher talks with students and shows some interest in students, but the conversations are limited and not prolonged. Usually, the teacher directs the conversations, although the conversations may focus on topics of interest to students. More often, there is a basic exchange of information but limited conversation. The teacher asks a mix of closed- and open-ended questions, although the closed-ended questions may require only short responses. Sometimes, the teacher extends students’ responses or repeats what students say. Sometimes, the teacher maps his or her own actions and the students’ actions through language and description. The teacher sometimes uses advanced language with students.

Ratings in the High Range.There are frequent conversations in the classroom, particularly between students and the teacher, and these conversations promote language use. Students are encouraged to converse and feel they are valued conversational partners. The teacher asks many open-ended questions that require students to communicate more complex ideas. The teacher often extends or repeats student responses. Frequently, the teacher maps his or her actions and student actions descriptively and uses advanced language with students.

Instructional Dialogue

Instructional Support domain, Grades 4− 12

Instructional Dialogue captures the purposeful use of content-focused discussion among teachers and students that is cumulative, with the teacher supporting students to chain ideas together in ways that lead to deeper understanding of content. Students take an active role in these dialogues, and both the teacher and students use strategies that facilitate extended dialogue (*CLASS Upper Elementary Manual*, p. 97, *CLASS Secondary Manual*, p. 101).

Table 15. Instructional Dialogue: Number of Classrooms for Each Rating and District Average

Instructional Dialogue District Average\*: 3.1

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | Low Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | High Range | High Range | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 44 | 3.1 |
| Grades 4-5\*\* | 2 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 3.4 |
| Grades 6-8 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 3.0 |
| Grades 9-12 | 3 | 3 | 8 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 20 | 3.1 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 15, the district average is computed as:   
([1 x 6] + [2 x 6] + [3 x 15] + [4 x 12] + [5 x 4] + [6 x 1]) ÷ 44 observations = 3.1

\*\*Instructional Dialogue does not appear in the CLASS K-3 Manual, therefore scores for the Elementary School Level represent grades 4-5 only.

Ratings in the Low Range. At the low range, there are no or few discussions in the class, the discussions are not related to content or skill development, or the discussions contain only simple question-response exchanges between the teacher and students. The class is dominated by teacher talk, and discussion is limited. The teacher and students ask closed-ended questions; rarely acknowledge, report, or extend other students’ comments; and/or appear disinterested in other students’ comments, resulting in many students not being engaged in instructional dialogues.

Ratings in the Middle Range. At this range, there are occasional content-based discussions in class among teachers and students; however, these exchanges are brief or quickly move from one topic to another without follow-up questions or comments from the teacher and other students. The class is mostly dominated by teacher talk, although there are times when students take a more active role, or there are distributed dialogues that involve only a few students in the class. The teacher and students sometimes facilitate and encourage more elaborate dialogue, but such efforts are brief, inconsistent, or ineffective at consistently engaging students in extended dialogues.

Ratings in the High Range.At the high range, there are frequent, content-driven discussions in the class between teachers and students or among students. The discussions build depth of knowledge through cumulative, contingent exchanges. The class dialogues are distributed in a way that the teacher and the majority of students take an active role or students are actively engaged in instructional dialogues with each other. The teacher and students frequently use strategies that encourage more elaborate dialogue, such as open-ended questions, repetition or extension, and active listening. Students respond to these techniques by fully participating in extended dialogues.

Student Engagement

Student Engagement domain, Grades 4−12

Student Engagement refers to the extent to which all students in the class are focused and participating in the learning activity that is presented or facilitated by the teacher. The difference between passive engagement and active engagement is reflected in this rating (*CLASS Upper Elementary Manual*, p. 105).

Table 16. Student Engagement: Number of Classrooms for Each Rating and District Average

Student Engagement District Average\*: 5.0

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Band | Low Range | Low Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | High Range | High Range | n | Average |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 44 | 5.0 |
| Grades 4-5\*\* | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 10 | 5.7 |
| Grades 6-8 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 2 | 14 | 5.5 |
| Grades 9-12 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 20 | 4.3 |

\*The district average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 16, the district average is computed as:   
([2 x 2] + [3 x 6] + [4 x 8] + [5 x 8] + [6 x 15] + [7 x 5]) ÷ 44 observations = 5.0

\*\*Student Engagement does not appear in the CLASS K-3 Manual, therefore scores for the Elementary School Level represent grades 4-5 only.

Ratings in the Low Range. In the low range, the majority of students appear distracted or disengaged.

Ratings in the Middle Range. In the middle range, students are passively engaged, listening to or watching the teacher; student engagement is mixed, with the majority of students actively engaged for part of the time and disengaged for the rest of the time; or there is a mix of student engagement, with some students actively engaged and some students disengaged.

Ratings in the High Range. In the high range, most students are actively engaged in the classroom discussions and activities.

Summary of Average Ratings: Grades K–5

Table 17. Summary Table of Average Ratings for Each Dimension in Grades K–5

|  | Low Range | Low Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | High Range | High Range | n | Average Scores\* |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |  |  |
| **Emotional Support Domain** | 0 | 1 | 10 | 14 | 28 | 23 | 40 | 116 | 5.6 |
| Positive Climate | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 13 | 5 | 6 | 29 | 5.4 |
| Negative Climate\*\* | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 29 | 6.9 |
| Teacher Sensitivity | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 16 | 6 | 29 | 5.9 |
| Regard for Student Perspectives | 0 | 1 | 8 | 8 | 10 | 2 | 0 | 29 | 4.1 |
| **Classroom Organization Domain** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 58 | 87 | 6.5 |
| Behavior Management | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 28 | 29 | 6.9 |
| Productivity | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 27 | 29 | 6.9 |
| Instructional Learning Formats\*\*\* | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 17 | 3 | 29 | 5.7 |
| **Instructional Support Domain** | 9 | 13 | 16 | 25 | 25 | 9 | 0 | 97 | 3.7 |
| Concept Development (K-3 only) | 1 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 19 | 3.8 |
| Content Understanding (UE only) | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 10 | 4.1 |
| Analysis and Inquiry (UE only) | 4 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 2.3 |
| Quality of Feedback | 0 | 4 | 6 | 7 | 9 | 3 | 0 | 29 | 4.0 |
| Language Modeling (K-3 only) | 1 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 19 | 3.9 |
| Instructional Dialogue (UE only) | 2 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 3.4 |
| **Student Engagement (UE only)** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **2** | **1** | **5** | **2** | **10** | **5.7** |

\*The district average is an average of the scores. For example, for Positive Climate, the district average is computed as: ([3 x 1] + [4 x 4] + [5 x 13] + [6 x 5] + [7 x 6]) ÷ 29 observations = 5.4

\*\*Negative Climate is rated on an inverse scale. An original score of 1 is given a value of 7. The scoring in the table reflects the normalized adjustment: ([3 x 1] + [7 x 28]) ÷ 29 observations = 6.9. In addition, Negative Climate appears in the Classroom Organization Domain for the Upper Elementary Manual.

\*\*\*Instructional Learning Formats appears in the Instructional Support Domain for the Upper Elementary Manual.

Summary of Average Ratings: Grades 6–8

Table 18. Summary Table of Average Ratings for Each Dimension in Grades 6–8

|  | Low Range | Low Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | High Range | High Range | n | Average Scores\* |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |  |  |
| Emotional Support Domain | 0 | 1 | 9 | 6 | 6 | 12 | 8 | 42 | 5.0 |
| Positive Climate | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 2 | 14 | 5.6 |
| Teacher Sensitivity | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 6 | 14 | 6.0 |
| Regard for Student Perspectives | 0 | 1 | 8 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 3.4 |
| Classroom Organization Domain | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 40 | 42 | 7.0 |
| Behavior Management | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 14 | 7.0 |
| Productivity | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 13 | 14 | 6.9 |
| Negative Climate\*\* | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 13 | 14 | 6.9 |
| Instructional Support Domain | 8 | 8 | 16 | 14 | 11 | 9 | 4 | 70 | 3.8 |
| Instructional Learning Formats | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 14 | 5.5 |
| Content Understanding | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 14 | 4.7 |
| Analysis and Inquiry | 3 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 2.5 |
| Quality of Feedback | 4 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 14 | 3.2 |
| Instructional Dialogue | 1 | 3 | 6 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 3.0 |
| Student Engagement | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 2 | 14 | 5.5 |

\*The district average is an average of the scores. For example, for Positive Climate, the district average is computed as: ([4 x 2] + [5 x 3] + [6 x 7] + [7 x 2]) ÷ 14 observations = 5.6

\*\*Negative Climate is rated on an inverse scale. An original score of 1 is given a value of 7. The scoring in the table reflects the normalized adjustment: ([6 x 1] + [7 x 13]) ÷ 14 observations = 6.9

Summary of Average Ratings: Grades 9–12

Table 19. Summary Table of Average Ratings for Each Dimension in Grades 9–12

|  | Low Range | Low Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | Middle Range | High Range | High Range | n | Average Scores\* |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |  |  |
| Emotional Support Domain | 0 | 11 | 13 | 12 | 18 | 6 | 0 | 60 | 3.9 |
| Positive Climate | 0 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 6 | 4 | 0 | 20 | 4.4 |
| Teacher Sensitivity | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 10 | 2 | 0 | 20 | 4.5 |
| Regard for Student Perspectives | 0 | 8 | 8 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 2.9 |
| Classroom Organization Domain | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 54 | 60 | 6.9 |
| Behavior Management | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 19 | 20 | 7.0 |
| Productivity | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 17 | 20 | 6.7 |
| Negative Climate\*\* | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 18 | 20 | 6.9 |
| Instructional Support Domain | 13 | 12 | 34 | 21 | 18 | 2 | 0 | 100 | 3.3 |
| Instructional Learning Formats | 0 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 11 | 1 | 0 | 20 | 4.4 |
| Content Understanding | 0 | 2 | 6 | 9 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 3.7 |
| Analysis and Inquiry | 8 | 3 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 2.3 |
| Quality of Feedback | 2 | 4 | 9 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 2.9 |
| Instructional Dialogue | 3 | 3 | 8 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 20 | 3.1 |
| Student Engagement | 0 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 20 | 4.3 |

\*The district average is an average of the scores. For example, for Positive Climate, the district average is computed as: ([2 x 2] + [3 x 3] + [4 x 5] + [5 x 6] + [6 x 4]) ÷ 20 observations = 4.4

\*\*Negative Climate is rated on an inverse scale. An original score of 1 is given a value of 7. The scoring in the table reflects the normalized adjustment: ([6 x 2] + [7 x 18]) ÷ 20 observations = 6.9
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## Appendix C. Resources to Support Implementation of DESE’s District Standards and Indicators

Table C1. Resources to Support Leadership and Governance

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Resource | Description |
| [Coherence Guidebook](https://www.doe.mass.edu/csdp/guidebook/coherence-guidebook.pdf)\* | The guidebook illustrates a systems-level path toward deeper learning. School system leaders and teams may use the guidebook, along with its companion self-assessment, to articulate a vision of deeper learning, identify high-leverage instructional priorities, refine tiered supports, and leverage systems and structures—all in service of the articulated vision. |
| [New Superintendent Induction Program (NSIP)](https://www.massupt.org/professional-development/annual-programs/new-superintendent-induction-program/) | In partnership with the Massachusetts Association of School Superintendents, the New Superintendent Induction Program (NSIP) is a three-year professional development program for superintendents in their first 3 years of their position in a Massachusetts school district. The curriculum is aligned to DESE’s Educational Vision and supports new superintendents with developing the skills and competencies to be effective leaders of their school districts. |
| [Principal Induction and Mentoring Handbook](https://www.doe.mass.edu/edeffectiveness/mentor/principal.html) | A series of modules designed to support novice principals and their mentors in the development of antiracist leadership competencies aligned to the Professional Standards for Administrative Leadership. |
| [Planning for Success In Massachusetts](https://www.doe.mass.edu/research/success/) | Planning for Success (PfS) is an inclusive, hands-on planning process designed to build district and school capacity and coherence while also building community understanding and support. |

\*The Coherence Guidebook may be useful across multiple standard areas including Leadership and Governance, Curriculum and Instruction, Assessment, and Student Support

Table C2. Resources to Support Curriculum and Instruction

| Resource | **Description** |
| --- | --- |
| Curriculum Frameworks and Resources   * [Curriculum Matters Webpage](https://www.doe.mass.edu/instruction/impd/default.html) * [Curriculum Frameworks Resources](https://www.doe.mass.edu/frameworks/current.html) * [IMplement MA](https://www.doe.mass.edu/instruction/impd/implement-ma.html) * [CURATE](https://www.doe.mass.edu/instruction/curate/default.html)   [Supporting Culturally and Linguistically Sustaining Practices](https://www.doe.mass.edu/instruction/culturally-sustaining/default.html) | DESE offers a suite of resources to support the use of high-quality curriculum that is culturally and linguistically sustaining. These resources include the curriculum frameworks and IMplement MA, our recommended four-phase process to prepare for, select, launch, and implement new high-quality instructional materials with key tasks and action steps. Additionally, CURATE convenes panels of Massachusetts teachers to review and rate curriculum. These ratings are posted publicly to support schools and districts in selected high-quality instructional materials. Finally, the Supporting Culturally and Linguistically Sustaining Practices webpage provides DESE’s definition of these practices and highlights their importance in our schools and classrooms. |
| [Mass Literacy Guide](https://www.doe.mass.edu/massliteracy/) | Mass Literacy is a statewide effort to empower educators with the evidence-based practices for literacy that all students need. Evidence-based instruction, provided within schools and classrooms that are culturally and linguistically sustaining, will put our youngest students on a path toward literacy for life. |
| [Foundations for Inclusive Practices](https://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/guidebook/) | This Guidebook includes tools for districts, schools, and educators that are aligned to the MA Educator Evaluation Framework and promote evidence-based best practices for inclusion. |
| [Guidebook of Culturally Diverse Artists and Artworks](https://view.officeapps.live.com/op/view.aspx?src=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.doe.mass.edu%2Finstruction%2Farts%2Fdiverse-arts-guidebook.docx&wdOrigin=BROWSELINK) | The purpose of this resource is to promote culturally responsive teaching in the arts through the study of culturally diverse artists and their artworks. This guidebook highlights art made by people with racial identities that historically have been and continue to be marginalized. |
| [Massachusetts Blueprint for English Learner Success](https://www.doe.mass.edu/ele/blueprint/default.html) | Framework for English learner education in MA, with embedded Quick Reference Guides (QRGs) and other resources to support implementation. |
| Massachusetts Curricular Resources   * [Appleseeds](https://sites.google.com/view/appleseedsk2/home) * [Investigating History](https://www.doe.mass.edu/investigatinghistory/) * [OpenSciEd](https://www.doe.mass.edu/stem/ste/openscied.html) | Free, open-source curricular resources aligned to the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks. |
| [Massachusetts Dyslexia Guidelines](https://www.doe.mass.edu/sped/dyslexia-guidelines.pdf) | Clear and practical guidelines for early screening, instruction, and intervention for students with reading difficulties and neurological learning disabilities, including dyslexia. |
| [Next Generation ESL Toolkit](https://www.doe.mass.edu/ele/esl-toolkit/default.html) | The ESL Toolkit provides a common entry point for educators to learn about Next Generation ESL (NGESL) instruction in Massachusetts. |
| [Synthesized ILT Framework](https://view.officeapps.live.com/op/view.aspx?src=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.doe.mass.edu%2Fcsdp%2Fguidebook%2Fappendix-ilt-framework.docx&wdOrigin=BROWSELINK) | District and school teams can use this resource to reflect and identify specific actions they could take to establish or improve their instructional leadership teams (ILTs). |

Table C3. Resources to Support Assessment

| Resource | Description |
| --- | --- |
| [Assessment Literacy Continuum](https://www.doe.mass.edu/acls/assessment/continuum.pdf) | Tool to help teachers identify what aspects of assessment literacy they should focus on for their own goal setting. |
| [Curriculum-Embedded Performance Assessments](https://www.doe.mass.edu/stem/ste/assess-resources.html) | Pending funding, this program will provide resources and professional learning for classroom-based, curriculum-embedded performance tasks in K-8 science with implementation and instructional supports aligned to the Innovative Assessment (STE). |
| [District Data Team Toolkit](http://www.doe.mass.edu/accountability/toolkit/) | A set of resources to help a district establish, grow, and maintain a culture of inquiry and data use through a district data team. |
| [Early Literacy Screening](https://www.doe.mass.edu/instruction/screening-assessments/default.html) | Guidance and support for schools and districts to select and use an approved early literacy universal screening assessment. |
| [Student Assessment](https://www.doe.mass.edu/assessment/) | Statewide assessments help parents, students, educators, and policymakers determine where districts, schools, and students are meeting expectations and where they need additional support. |

Table C4. Resources to Support Human Resources and Professional Development

| Resource | Description |
| --- | --- |
| [Early Literacy Observation Tools](https://www.doe.mass.edu/edprep/resources/early-literacy-observation.html) | This tool supports the observation and provision of high-quality feedback to teacher candidates on their practice in evidence-based early literacy. |
| [Educator Evaluation Implementation Resources](https://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/implementation/default.html) | A suite of resources and practical tools for effective and equitable implementation of educator evaluation, including Focus Indicators, a subset of Indicators from the Classroom Teacher and School Level Administrator Rubrics that represent high-priority practices for the school year. |
| Induction and Mentoring   * [Teacher Induction and Mentoring](https://www.doe.mass.edu/edeffectiveness/mentor/default.html) * [Principal Induction and Mentoring](https://www.doe.mass.edu/edeffectiveness/mentor/principal.html)   [Induction and Mentoring Annual Report](https://www.doe.mass.edu/edeffectiveness/mentor/default.html) | Resources that highlight best practices and reinforce the recently updated guidelines and standards for induction and mentoring. |
| [Massachusetts Tests for Educator Licensure (MTEL)](https://www.doe.mass.edu/mtel/) | Information on MTEL exams, MTEL alternatives, and licensure requirements for educators. |
| [OPTIC](https://www.ma-optic.com/) | A professional development tool that supports Massachusetts educators to build a shared understanding of high-quality instruction and improve the feedback that teachers receive. |
| [Professional Learning Partner Guide](https://plpartnerguide.org/) | A free, online, searchable list of vetted professional development providers who have expertise in specific sets of high-quality instructional materials. Schools and districts can use this guide to easily find PD providers to support the launch or implementation of high-quality instructional materials. |
| [Promising Recruitment, Selection and Retention Strategies for a Diverse Massachusetts Teacher Workforce](https://view.officeapps.live.com/op/view.aspx?src=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.doe.mass.edu%2Fcsi%2Fdiverse-workforce%2Fteacher-diversification.docx&wdOrigin=BROWSELINK) | This guidebook provides a framework to help district and school leaders design and implement a teacher diversification strategy to improve student achievement and create equitable learning experiences. |
| [“What to Look For” Observation Guides](https://www.doe.mass.edu/frameworks/observation/) | Observation tools to help district staff observe instruction. |
| [Talent Guide](https://www.doe.mass.edu/edeffectiveness/talent-guide/default.html) | An online hub of resources, considerations, and updates for recruiting, hiring, evaluating, and supporting educators and school staff, with a focus on equity. |
| [WIDA Professional Development](https://www.doe.mass.edu/ele/prof-learning/wida/default.html) | WIDA professional development provides great information and strategies to support multilingual learners in Massachusetts public schools, and WIDA PDPs satisfy educator licensure renewal requirements. These DESE Sponsored courses are available at no cost to participants and are perfect for teams of teachers seeking impactful collaboration to support students’ access to rigorous course content. |

Table C5. Resources to Support Student Support

| Resource | Description |
| --- | --- |
| Dropout Prevention and Reengagement   * [Dropout Prevention and Reengagement (DPR) Resources](https://www.doe.mass.edu/ccte/sec-supports/massgrad/default.html) * [Early Warning Indicator System (EWIS)](https://www.doe.mass.edu/ccte/sec-supports/ewis/default.html) | DPR efforts are designed to support students at-risk of not graduating or reengage students who have left school with opportunities to gain the academic, personal/social, and work readiness skills necessary to graduate and lead productive lives. EWIS includes tools for districts to identify students who are at risk and help get them back on track. |
| Educational Stability Resources   * [Educational Stability for Highly Mobile Students](https://www.doe.mass.edu/sfs/edstability.html) * [SLIFE Guidance and Toolkit](https://www.doe.mass.edu/ele/slife/default.html) * [Resources for Supporting Immigrant and Refugee Students](https://www.doe.mass.edu/ele/resources/immigrant-refugee.html) | The linked resources provide guidance, technical assistance, professional learning opportunities, grants, and other supports to ensure that students experiencing homelessness, those in foster care, migrant and refugee students, those with limited or interrupted formal education, and students in military families have access to a consistent and high-quality public education. |
| Emergency Management Guidance ([Federal](https://rems.ed.gov/?AspxAutoDetectCookieSupport=1) and [State](https://www.doe.mass.edu/sfs/emergencyplan/default.html)) | Guidance and Technical Assistance for districts/schools related to emergency management planning and implementation. |
| Family Partnerships   * [DESE Family Portal](https://www.doe.mass.edu/families/) * [Strengthening Partnerships: A Framework for Prenatal through Young Adulthood Family Engagement in Massachusetts](https://www.doe.mass.edu/sfs/family-engagement-framework.pdf) | Resources for authentically engaging families in their child’s education and centering families voices in school and district decision-making. |
| MTSS Resources:   * [MTSS Blueprint, Self-Assessment, and Resources](https://www.doe.mass.edu/sfss/mtss/) * [Massachusetts Tools for Schools](https://matoolsforschools.com/) | MTSS is a framework for how school districts can build the necessary systems to ensure that every student receives a high-quality educational experience. |
| Safe and Supportive Schools:   * [Safe and Supportive Schools Framework and Self-Reflection Tool](https://www.sassma.org/) * [Safe Schools Program for LGBTQ Students](https://www.doe.mass.edu/sfs/lgbtq/) * [Bullying Prevention and Intervention](https://www.doe.mass.edu/sfs/bullying/default.html) * [Rethinking Discipline Initiative](https://www.doe.mass.edu/sfs/discipline/) | These resources can help guide school- and district-based teams to create safer and more supportive school climates and cultures that allow all students to thrive. |
| [School Wellness Initiative for Thriving Community Health (SWITCH)](https://massschoolwellness.org/) | SWITCH provides resources that support and advance wellness efforts for Massachusetts students, schools, and communities. |
| Social Emotional Learning:   * [SEL/APL Standards (Pk/K)](https://view.officeapps.live.com/op/view.aspx?src=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.doe.mass.edu%2Fsfs%2Fearlylearning%2Fresources%2FSEL-APL-Standards.docx&wdOrigin=BROWSELINK) * [Playful Learning Institute, Preschool through 3rd Grade](https://www.doe.mass.edu/sfs/earlylearning/pli.html) * [Culturally Responsive Social-Emotional Competency Development](https://www.doe.mass.edu/sfs/sel/sel-all.docx) | These resources provide evidence-based and developmentally appropriate guidance around supporting social emotional learning in schools. |

Table C6. Resources to Support Financial and Asset Management

| Resource | Description |
| --- | --- |
| [General Resources for Federal Grant Programs](https://www.doe.mass.edu/federalgrants/resources/default.html) | General federal grants resources. |
| [Office for Food and Nutrition Programs](https://www.doe.mass.edu/cnp/) | Resources for school districts, childcare centers, family day care homes, adult day health programs, Summer Eats community organizations, USDA Foods storage and distribution vendors, food banks, and anti-hunger organizations across the Commonwealth. |
| [Planning for Success (PfS)](https://www.doe.mass.edu/research/success/) | An inclusive, hands-on planning process designed to build district and school capacity and coherence while also building community understanding and support. |
| [Resource Allocation and District Action Reports (RADAR)](https://www.doe.mass.edu/research/radar/) | RADAR is a suite of innovative data reports, case studies, and other resources that provide a new approach to resource decisions. |
| [School Breakfast: Breakfast After the Bell Resources](https://www.projectbread.org/resource-directory/breakfast-after-the-bell-resources) | The Breakfast After the Bell Toolkit Series is designed to help with the launch and implementation of alternative breakfast models. |
| [School Meals Newsletter](https://us14.list-manage.com/subscribe?u=d8f37d1a90dacd97f207f0b4a&id=d29c4bc847) | Short articles summarizing current events including: changes in federal/ state requirements; current grant opportunities; and notable dates. |
| [Summer Eats | Free Meals for Kids and Teens in MA](https://www.projectbread.org/summer-eats-program?utm_source=google&utm_medium=cpc&utm_campaign=summereats_pmax&utm_content=english-2023&utm_source=google&utm_medium=cpc&utm_campaign=summereats_pmax&utm_content=english-2023&gclid=CjwKCAjwzo2mBhAUEiwAf7wjkljB4ngm0uZLSTYsl5hK5QGTkC3mKF_4ae_5AUxyrVs6UiPIIrys1RoCQV0QAvD_BwE) | Summer Eats is a free-of-charge program that provides free meals to all kids and teens, ages 18 and under, at locations all across Massachusetts during the summer months. |

## Appendix D. Enrollment, Attendance, Expenditures

Table D1a. Conway: Student Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity, 2024-2025

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | *N* (District) | Percentage of District | *N* (State) | Percentage of State |
| All Students | 152 | 100.0 | 915,932 | 100.0 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 0 | 0.0 | 2,272 | 0.2 |
| Asian | 1 | 0.7 | 68,608 | 7.5 |
| Black or African American | 0 | 0.0 | 93,245 | 10.2 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 4 | 2.6 | 236,839 | 25.9 |
| Multi-Race, not Hispanic or Latino | 6 | 3.9 | 42,303 | 4.6 |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | 0 | 0.0 | 800 | 0.1 |
| White | 141 | 92.8 | 471,865 | 51.5 |

*Note*. As of October 1, 2024.

Table D1b. Deerfield: Student Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity, 2024-2025

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | *N* (District) | Percentage of District | *N* (State) | Percentage of State |
| All Students | 301 | 100.0 | 915,932 | 100.0 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 0 | 0.0 | 2,272 | 0.2 |
| Asian | 4 | 1.3 | 68,608 | 7.5 |
| Black or African American | 6 | 2.0 | 93,245 | 10.2 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 13 | 4.3 | 236,839 | 25.9 |
| Multi-Race, not Hispanic or Latino | 17 | 5.6 | 42,303 | 4.6 |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | 0 | 0.0 | 800 | 0.1 |
| White | 261 | 86.7 | 471,865 | 51.5 |

*Note*. As of October 1, 2024.

Table D1c. Sunderland: Student Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity, 2024-2025

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | *N* (District) | Percentage of District | *N* (State) | Percentage of State |
| All Students | 174 | 100.0 | 915,932 | 100.0 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 0 | 0.0 | 2,272 | 0.2 |
| Asian | 12 | 6.9 | 68,608 | 7.5 |
| Black or African American | 8 | 4.6 | 93,245 | 10.2 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 25 | 14.4 | 236,839 | 25.9 |
| Multi-Race, not Hispanic or Latino | 11 | 6.3 | 42,303 | 4.6 |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | 0 | 0.0 | 800 | 0.1 |
| White | 118 | 67.8 | 471,865 | 51.5 |

*Note*. As of October 1, 2024.

Table D1d. Whately: Student Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity, 2024-2025

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | *N* (District) | Percentage of District | *N* (State) | Percentage of State |
| All Students | 133 | 100.0 | 915,932 | 100.0 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 0 | 0.0 | 2,272 | 0.2 |
| Asian | 0 | 0.0 | 68,608 | 7.5 |
| Black or African American | 1 | 0.8 | 93,245 | 10.2 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 5 | 3.8 | 236,839 | 25.9 |
| Multi-Race, not Hispanic or Latino | 2 | 1.5 | 42,303 | 4.6 |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | 0 | 0.0 | 800 | 0.1 |
| White | 125 | 94.0 | 471,865 | 51.5 |

*Note*. As of October 1, 2024.

Table D1e. Frontier: Student Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity, 2024-2025

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | *N* (District) | Percentage of District | *N* (State) | Percentage of State |
| All Students | 588 | 100.0 | 915,932 | 100.0 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 0 | 0.0 | 2,272 | 0.2 |
| Asian | 10 | 1.7 | 68,608 | 7.5 |
| Black or African American | 9 | 1.5 | 93,245 | 10.2 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 42 | 7.1 | 236,839 | 25.9 |
| Multi-Race, not Hispanic or Latino | 36 | 6.1 | 42,303 | 4.6 |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | 1 | 0.2 | 800 | 0.1 |
| White | 490 | 83.3 | 471,865 | 51.5 |

*Note*. As of October 1, 2024.

Table D2a. Conway: Student Enrollment by High Needs Populations, 2024-2025

| Group | *N*  (District) | Percentage of High Needs  (District) | Percentage of District | *N*  (State) | Percentage of High Needs  (State) | Percentage of State |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| High Needs | 61 | 100.0 | 40.1 | 517,093 | 100.0 | 55.8 |
| English Learners | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 127,673 | 24.7 | 13.9 |
| Low Income | 39 | 63.9 | 25.7 | 385,161 | 74.5 | 42.1 |
| Students with Disabilities | 34 | 55.7 | 22.4 | 190,967 | 36.9 | 20.6 |

*Note*. As of October 1, 2024. District and state numbers and percentages for students with disabilities and High Needs are calculated including students in out-of-district placements. Total district enrollment including students in out-of-district placements is 152; total state enrollment including students in out-of-district placements is 926,057.

Table D2b. Deerfield: Student Enrollment by High Needs Populations, 2024-2025

| Group | *N*  (District) | Percentage of High Needs  (District) | Percentage of District | *N*  (State) | Percentage of High Needs  (State) | Percentage of State |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| High Needs | 115 | 100.0 | 38.2 | 517,093 | 100.0 | 55.8 |
| English Learners | 1 | 0.9 | 0.3 | 127,673 | 24.7 | 13.9 |
| Low Income | 73 | 63.5 | 24.3 | 385,161 | 74.5 | 42.1 |
| Students with Disabilities | 73 | 63.5 | 24.3 | 190,967 | 36.9 | 20.6 |

*Note*. As of October 1, 2024. District and state numbers and percentages for students with disabilities and High Needs are calculated including students in out-of-district placements. Total district enrollment including students in out-of-district placements is 301; total state enrollment including students in out-of-district placements is 926,057.

Table D2c. Sunderland: Student Enrollment by High Needs Populations, 2024-2025

| Group | *N*  (District) | Percentage of High Needs  (District) | Percentage of District | *N*  (State) | Percentage of High Needs  (State) | Percentage of State |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| High Needs | 92 | 100.0 | 52.6 | 517,093 | 100.0 | 55.8 |
| English Learners | 13 | 14.1 | 7.5 | 127,673 | 24.7 | 13.9 |
| Low income | 63 | 68.5 | 36.2 | 385,161 | 74.5 | 42.1 |
| Students with Disabilities | 41 | 44.6 | 23.4 | 190,967 | 36.9 | 20.6 |

*Note*. As of October 1, 2024. District and state numbers and percentages for students with disabilities and High Needs are calculated including students in out-of-district placements. Total district enrollment including students in out-of-district placements is 175; total state enrollment including students in out-of-district placements is 926,057.

Table D2d. Whately: Student Enrollment by High Needs Populations, 2024-2025

| Group | *N*  (District) | Percentage of High Needs  (District) | Percentage of District | *N*  (State) | Percentage of High Needs  (State) | Percentage of State |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| High Needs | 47 | 100.0 | 35.3 | 517,093 | 100.0 | 55.8 |
| English Learners | 1 | 2.1 | 0.8 | 127,673 | 24.7 | 13.9 |
| Low income | 26 | 55.3 | 19.5 | 385,161 | 74.5 | 42.1 |
| Students with Disabilities | 29 | 61.7 | 21.8 | 190,967 | 36.9 | 20.6 |

*Note*. As of October 1, 2024. District and state numbers and percentages for students with disabilities and High Needs are calculated including students in out-of-district placements. Total district enrollment including students in out-of-district placements is 133; total state enrollment including students in out-of-district placements is 926,057.

Table D2e. Frontier: Student Enrollment by High Needs Populations, 2024-2025

| Group | *N*  (District) | Percentage of High Needs  (District) | Percentage of District | *N*  (State) | Percentage of High Needs  (State) | Percentage of State |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| High Needs | 204 | 100.0 | 34.2 | 517,093 | 100.0 | 55.8 |
| English Learners | 5 | 2.5 | 0.9 | 127,673 | 24.7 | 13.9 |
| Low income | 127 | 62.3 | 21.6 | 385,161 | 74.5 | 42.1 |
| Students with Disabilities | 125 | 61.3 | 21.0 | 190,967 | 36.9 | 20.6 |

*Note*. As of October 1, 2024. District and state numbers and percentages for students with disabilities and High Needs are calculated including students in out-of-district placements. Total district enrollment including students in out-of-district placements is 596; total state enrollment including students in out-of-district placements is 926,057.

Table D3a. Conway: Chronic Absence a Rates by Student Group, 2022-2024

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | *N* (2024) | 2022 (%) | 2023 (%) | 2024 (%) | State 2024 (%) |
| All Students | 149 | 9.5 | 11.8 | 12.1 | 19.7 |
| African American/Black | — | — | — | — | 22.5 |
| Asian | — | — | — | — | 11.8 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 6 | — | 33.3 | 0.0 | 31.3 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 6 | 16.7 | — | 0.0 | 20.6 |
| Native American | — | — | — | — | 28.5 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | — | — | — | — | 24.3 |
| White | 137 | 9.6 | 10.3 | 13.1 | 14.4 |
| High Needs | 70 | 11.9 | 8.9 | 14.3 | 27.2 |
| Low Income | 45 | 13.5 | 13.2 | 20.0 | 30.3 |
| English Learners | 1 | — | — | — | 29.9 |
| Students with Disabilities | 40 | 12.9 | 3.0 | 12.5 | 27.5 |

a The percentage of students absent 10 percent or more of their total number of student days of membership in a school.

Table D3b. Deerfield: Chronic Absence a Rates by Student Group, 2022-2024

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | *N* (2024) | 2022 (%) | 2023 (%) | 2024 (%) | State 2024 (%) |
| All Students | 320 | 15.2 | 18.8 | 14.7 | 19.7 |
| African American/Black | 5 | — | — | — | 22.5 |
| Asian | 2 | — | — | — | 11.8 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 16 | 10.5 | 15.8 | 18.8 | 31.3 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 19 | 18.5 | 16.7 | 21.1 | 20.6 |
| Native American | — | — | — | — | 28.5 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | — | — | — | — | 24.3 |
| White | 278 | 15.3 | 18.5 | 12.9 | 14.4 |
| High Needs | 132 | 18.7 | 27.4 | 22.0 | 27.2 |
| Low Income | 82 | 20.9 | 28.4 | 24.4 | 30.3 |
| English Learners | 3 | — | — | — | 29.9 |
| Students with Disabilities | 79 | 20.0 | 29.3 | 22.8 | 27.5 |

a The percentage of students absent 10 percent or more of their total number of student days of membership in a school.

Table D3c. Sunderland: Chronic Absence a Rates by Student Group, 2022-2024

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | *N* (2024) | 2022 (%) | 2023 (%) | 2024 (%) | State 2024 (%) |
| All Students | 190 | 22.7 | 20.5 | 15.8 | 19.7 |
| African American/Black | 6 | 50.0 | — | 16.7 | 22.5 |
| Asian | 18 | 22.7 | 22.2 | 22.2 | 11.8 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 25 | 17.4 | 28.6 | 20.0 | 31.3 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 15 | 21.4 | 25.0 | 26.7 | 20.6 |
| Native American | — | — | — | — | 28.5 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | — | — | — | — | 24.3 |
| White | 126 | 21.5 | 18.6 | 12.7 | 14.4 |
| High Needs | 103 | 31.9 | 31.5 | 19.4 | 27.2 |
| Low Income | 75 | 33.3 | 30.3 | 17.3 | 30.3 |
| English Learners | 14 | 9.1 | 30.0 | 21.4 | 29.9 |
| Students with Disabilities | 47 | 37.3 | 40.0 | 19.1 | 27.5 |

a The percentage of students absent 10 percent or more of their total number of student days of membership in a school.

Table D3d. Whately: Chronic Absence a Rates by Student Group, 2022-2024

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | *N* (2024) | 2022 (%) | 2023 (%) | 2024 (%) | State 2024 (%) |
| All Students | 127 | 2.4 | 12.4 | 11.0 | 19.7 |
| African American/Black | 1 | — | — | — | 22.5 |
| Asian | — | — | — | — | 11.8 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 6 | — | 0.0 | 16.7 | 31.3 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 2 | — | — | — | 20.6 |
| Native American | — | — | — | — | 28.5 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | — | — | — | — | 24.3 |
| White | 118 | 2.5 | 12.6 | 11.0 | 14.4 |
| High Needs | 53 | 6.1 | 22.4 | 18.9 | 27.2 |
| Low Income | 31 | 8.3 | 31.3 | 32.3 | 30.3 |
| English Learners | 2 | 16.7 | — | — | 29.9 |
| Students with Disabilities | 31 | 0.0 | 9.5 | 16.1 | 27.5 |

a The percentage of students absent 10 percent or more of their total number of student days of membership in a school.

Table D3e. Frontier: Chronic Absence a Rates by Student Group, 2022-2024

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | *N* (2024) | 2022 (%) | 2023 (%) | 2024 (%) | State 2024 (%) |
| All Students | 619 | 26.2 | 23.8 | 19.4 | 19.7 |
| African American/Black | 12 | 30.0 | 20.0 | 25.0 | 22.5 |
| Asian | 22 | 0.0 | 9.1 | 9.1 | 11.8 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 45 | 32.6 | 17.9 | 28.9 | 31.3 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 43 | 23.1 | 21.4 | 25.6 | 20.6 |
| Native American | — | — | — | — | 28.5 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | — | — | — | — | 24.3 |
| White | 497 | 26.6 | 25.1 | 18.3 | 14.4 |
| High Needs | 235 | 35.7 | 35.3 | 30.2 | 27.2 |
| Low Income | 174 | 37.2 | 37.7 | 32.2 | 30.3 |
| English Learners | 4 | — | — | — | 29.9 |
| Students with Disabilities | 119 | 32.0 | 32.2 | 30.3 | 27.5 |

a The percentage of students absent 10 percent or more of their total number of student days of membership in a school.

Table D4a. Conway: Total Expenditures, Fiscal Years 2021-2023

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Expenditures | FY 2021 | FY 2022 | FY 2023 |
| By school committee | $2,311,349 | $2,021,561 | $2,088,234 |
| By municipality | $570,695 | $779,967 | $796,828 |
| Total from local appropriations | $2,882,044 | $2,801,527 | $2,885,062 |
| From revolving funds and grants | $472,030 | $824,308 | $895,674 |
| Total expenditures | $3,354,074 | $3,625,836 | $3,780,736 |

*Note*. Expenditures from the School Finance Dashboard sourced from [Resource Allocation and District Action Reports (RADAR)](https://www.doe.mass.edu/research/radar/default.html) last updated April 2025.

Table D4b. Deerfield: Total Expenditures, Fiscal Years 2021-2023

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Expenditures | FY 2021 | FY 2022 | FY 2023 |
| By school committee | $4,965,522 | $4,919,910 | $5,103,781 |
| By municipality | $1,455,206 | $1,325,296 | $1,504,037 |
| Total from local appropriations | $6,420,728 | $6,245,207 | $6,607,819 |
| From revolving funds and grants | $788,192 | $963,351 | $1,073,073 |
| Total expenditures | $7,208,920 | $7,208,557 | $7,680,892 |

*Note*. Expenditures from the School Finance Dashboard sourced from [Resource Allocation and District Action Reports (RADAR)](https://www.doe.mass.edu/research/radar/default.html) last updated April 2025.

Table D4c. Sunderland: Total Expenditures, Fiscal Years 2021-2023

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Expenditures | FY 2021 | FY 2022 | FY 2023 |
| By school committee | $2,954,918 | $2,976,549 | $3,145,725 |
| By municipality | $640,903 | $758,751 | $829,662 |
| Total from local appropriations | $3,595,821 | $3,735,300 | $3,975,388 |
| From revolving funds and grants | $846,263 | $1,030,670 | $1,171,252 |
| Total expenditures | $4,442,084 | $4,765,970 | $5,146,640 |

*Note*. Expenditures from the School Finance Dashboard sourced from [Resource Allocation and District Action Reports (RADAR)](https://www.doe.mass.edu/research/radar/default.html) last updated April 2025.

Table D4d. Whately: Total Expenditures, Fiscal Years 2021-2023

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Expenditures | FY 2021 | FY 2022 | FY 2023 |
| By school committee | $1,854,780 | $1,746,259 | $1,888,559 |
| By municipality | $446,624 | $538,667 | $499,004 |
| Total from local appropriations | $2,301,404 | $2,284,926 | $2,387,562 |
| From revolving funds and grants | $381,845 | $573,130 | $672,981 |
| Total expenditures | $2,683,249 | $2,858,056 | $3,060,543 |

*Note*. Expenditures from the School Finance Dashboard sourced from [Resource Allocation and District Action Reports (RADAR)](https://www.doe.mass.edu/research/radar/default.html) last updated April 2025.

Table D4e. Frontier: Total Expenditures, Fiscal Years 2021-2023

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Expenditures | FY 2021 | FY 2022 | FY 2023 |
| By school committee | $12,928,911 | $12,677,601 | $12,637,619 |
| By municipality | — | — | — |
| Total from local appropriations | $12,928,911 | $12,677,601 | $12,637,619 |
| From revolving funds and grants | $1,001,556 | $1,453,406 | $1,919,707 |
| Total expenditures | $13,930,466 | $14,131,007 | $14,557,327 |

*Note*. Expenditures from the School Finance Dashboard sourced from [Resource Allocation and District Action Reports (RADAR)](https://www.doe.mass.edu/research/radar/default.html) last updated April 2025.

Table D5a. Conway: Chapter 70 State Aid and Net School Spending, Fiscal Years 2021-2023

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Chapter 70 aid to education program | FY 2021 | FY 2022 | FY 2023 |
| Chapter 70 state aid a | $626,464 | $628,804 | $633,484 |
| Required local contribution | $738,041 | $763,968 | $810,426 |
| Required net school spending b | $1,364,505 | $1,392,772 | $1,443,910 |
| Actual net school spending | $2,487,205 | $2,336,119 | $2,498,680 |
| Over/under required ($) | $1,122,700 | $943,347 | $1,054,770 |
| Over/under required (%) | 82.3% | 67.7% | 73.0% |

*Note*. Chapter 70 aid to education from Chapter 70 District Profiles sourced from [Chapter 70 Program - School Finance](https://www.doe.mass.edu/finance/chapter70/default.html) last updated August 8, 2024.

a Chapter 70 state aid funds are deposited in the local general fund and spent as local appropriations. b Required net school spending is the total of Chapter 70 aid and required local contribution. Net school spending includes only expenditures from local appropriations, not revolving funds, and grants. It includes expenditures for most administration, instruction, operations, and out-of-district tuitions. It does not include transportation, school lunches, debt, or capital.

Table D5b. Deerfield: Chapter 70 State Aid and Net School Spending, Fiscal Years 2021-2023

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Chapter 70 aid to education program | FY 2021 | FY 2022 | FY 2023 |
| Chapter 70 state aid a | $1,114,363 | $1,123,153 | $1,140,193 |
| Required local contribution | $2,732,273 | $2,636,157 | $2,731,289 |
| Required net school spending b | $3,846,636 | $3,759,310 | $3,871,482 |
| Actual net school spending | $6,144,849 | $6,010,117 | $6,312,569 |
| Over/under required ($) | $2,298,213 | $2,250,807 | $2,441,087 |
| Over/under required (%) | 59.7% | 59.9% | 63.1% |

*Note*. Chapter 70 aid to education from Chapter 70 District Profiles sourced from [Chapter 70 Program - School Finance](https://www.doe.mass.edu/finance/chapter70/default.html) last updated August 8, 2024.

a Chapter 70 state aid funds are deposited in the local general fund and spent as local appropriations. b Required net school spending is the total of Chapter 70 aid and required local contribution. Net school spending includes only expenditures from local appropriations, not revolving funds, and grants. It includes expenditures for most administration, instruction, operations, and out-of-district tuitions. It does not include transportation, school lunches, debt, or capital.

Table D5c. Sunderland: Chapter 70 State Aid and Net School Spending, Fiscal Years 2021-2023

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Chapter 70 aid to education program | FY 2021 | FY 2022 | FY 2023 |
| Chapter 70 state aid a | $872,838 | $877,068 | $886,728 |
| Required local contribution | $1,662,285 | $1,420,072 | $1,575,365 |
| Required net school spending b | $2,535,123 | $2,297,140 | $2,462,093 |
| Actual net school spending | $3,462,133 | $3,561,818 | $3,800,085 |
| Over/under required ($) | $927,010 | $1,264,678 | $1,337,992 |
| Over/under required (%) | 36.6% | 55.1% | 54.3% |

*Note*. Chapter 70 aid to education from Chapter 70 District Profiles sourced from [Chapter 70 Program - School Finance](https://www.doe.mass.edu/finance/chapter70/default.html) last updated August 8, 2024.

a Chapter 70 state aid funds are deposited in the local general fund and spent as local appropriations. b Required net school spending is the total of Chapter 70 aid and required local contribution. Net school spending includes only expenditures from local appropriations, not revolving funds, and grants. It includes expenditures for most administration, instruction, operations, and out-of-district tuitions. It does not include transportation, school lunches, debt, or capital.

Table D5d. Whately: Chapter 70 State Aid and Net School Spending, Fiscal Years 2021-2023

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Chapter 70 aid to education program | FY 2021 | FY 2022 | FY 2023 |
| Chapter 70 state aid a | $264,770 | $267,200 | $271,820 |
| Required local contribution | $739,905 | $774,927 | $730,678 |
| Required net school spending b | $1,004,675 | $1,042,127 | $1,002,498 |
| Actual net school spending | $2,229,057 | $2,135,190 | $2,315,112 |
| Over/under required ($) | $1,224,382 | $1,093,063 | $1,312,614 |
| Over/under required (%) | 121.9% | 104.9% | 130.9% |

*Note*. Chapter 70 aid to education from Chapter 70 District Profiles sourced from [Chapter 70 Program - School Finance](https://www.doe.mass.edu/finance/chapter70/default.html) last updated August 8, 2024.

a Chapter 70 state aid funds are deposited in the local general fund and spent as local appropriations. b Required net school spending is the total of Chapter 70 aid and required local contribution. Net school spending includes only expenditures from local appropriations, not revolving funds, and grants. It includes expenditures for most administration, instruction, operations, and out-of-district tuitions. It does not include transportation, school lunches, debt, or capital.

Table D5e. Frontier: Chapter 70 State Aid and Net School Spending, Fiscal Years 2021-2023

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Chapter 70 aid to education program | FY 2021 | FY 2022 | FY 2023 |
| Chapter 70 state aid a | $2,855,535 | $2,872,335 | $2,903,235 |
| Required local contribution | $5,440,174 | $5,465,964 | $5,342,316 |
| Required net school spending b | $8,295,709 | $8,338,299 | $8,245,551 |
| Actual net school spending | $12,380,798 | $11,987,168 | $11,967,902 |
| Over/under required ($) | $4,085,089 | $3,648,869 | $3,722,351 |
| Over/under required (%) | 49.2% | 43.8% | 45.1% |

*Note*. Chapter 70 aid to education from Chapter 70 District Profiles sourced from [Chapter 70 Program - School Finance](https://www.doe.mass.edu/finance/chapter70/default.html) last updated August 8, 2024.

a Chapter 70 state aid funds are deposited in the local general fund and spent as local appropriations. b Required net school spending is the total of Chapter 70 aid and required local contribution. Net school spending includes only expenditures from local appropriations, not revolving funds, and grants. It includes expenditures for most administration, instruction, operations, and out-of-district tuitions. It does not include transportation, school lunches, debt, or capital.

Table D6a. Conway: Expenditures Per In-District Pupil, Fiscal Years 2021-2023

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Expenditure category | FY 2021 | FY 2022 | FY 2023 |
| Administration | $694 | $671 | $917 |
| Instructional leadership (district and school) | $1,657 | $1,478 | $1,817 |
| Teachers | $8,393 | $7,838 | $8,600 |
| Other teaching services | $4,415 | $4,268 | $4,817 |
| Professional development | $176 | $260 | $158 |
| Instructional materials, equipment, and technology | $1,794 | $1,178 | $1,382 |
| Guidance, counseling, and testing services | $659 | $396 | $490 |
| Pupil services | $2,102 | $1,910 | $1,977 |
| Operations and maintenance | $2,027 | $2,303 | $2,876 |
| Insurance, retirement, and other fixed costs | $3,721 | $4,036 | $4,618 |
| Total expenditures per in-district pupil | $25,636 | $24,338 | $27,651 |

*Note*. Any discrepancy between expenditures and total is because of rounding. Expenditures from the School Finance Dashboard sourced from [Resource Allocation and District Action Reports (RADAR)](https://www.doe.mass.edu/research/radar/default.html) last updated April 2025.

Table D6b. Deerfield: Expenditures Per In-District Pupil, Fiscal Years 2021-2023

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Expenditure category | FY 2021 | FY 2022 | FY 2023 |
| Administration | $704 | $697 | $715 |
| Instructional leadership (district and school) | $1,331 | $1,269 | $1,384 |
| Teachers | $7,092 | $7,209 | $7,603 |
| Other teaching services | $3,225 | $3,320 | $3,523 |
| Professional development | $40 | $170 | $127 |
| Instructional materials, equipment, and technology | $1,741 | $934 | $1,045 |
| Guidance, counseling, and testing services | $524 | $465 | $394 |
| Pupil services | $1,286 | $1,818 | $1,566 |
| Operations and maintenance | $1,716 | $1,480 | $1,836 |
| Insurance, retirement, and other fixed costs | $3,606 | $3,028 | $3,246 |
| Total expenditures per in-district pupil | $21,265 | $20,391 | $21,439 |

*Note*. Any discrepancy between expenditures and total is because of rounding. Expenditures from the School Finance Dashboard sourced from [Resource Allocation and District Action Reports (RADAR)](https://www.doe.mass.edu/research/radar/default.html) last updated April 2025.

Table D6c. Sunderland: Expenditures Per In-District Pupil, Fiscal Years 2021-2023

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Expenditure category | FY 2021 | FY 2022 | FY 2023 |
| Administration | $633 | $628 | $675 |
| Instructional leadership (district and school) | $1,513 | $1,543 | $1,403 |
| Teachers | $7,966 | $8,263 | $9,107 |
| Other teaching services | $4,985 | $4,226 | $4,581 |
| Professional development | $108 | $208 | $222 |
| Instructional materials, equipment, and technology | $1,923 | $1,630 | $1,847 |
| Guidance, counseling, and testing services | $618 | $601 | $542 |
| Pupil services | $1,085 | $1,881 | $2,198 |
| Operations and maintenance | $1,559 | $1,767 | $2,869 |
| Insurance, retirement, and other fixed costs | $2,943 | $3,101 | $3,352 |
| Total expenditures per in-district pupil | $23,333 | $23,849 | $26,797 |

*Note*. Any discrepancy between expenditures and total is because of rounding. Expenditures from the School Finance Dashboard sourced from [Resource Allocation and District Action Reports (RADAR)](https://www.doe.mass.edu/research/radar/default.html) last updated April 2025.

.

Table D6d. Whately: Expenditures Per In-District Pupil, Fiscal Years 2021-2023

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Expenditure category | FY 2021 | FY 2022 | FY 2023 |
| Administration | $589 | $657 | $631 |
| Instructional leadership (district and school) | $1,963 | $1,836 | $1,970 |
| Teachers | $6,987 | $7,027 | $6,693 |
| Other teaching services | $3,517 | $3,089 | $3,526 |
| Professional development | $152 | $156 | $179 |
| Instructional materials, equipment, and technology | $1,587 | $1,287 | $1,443 |
| Guidance, counseling, and testing services | $728 | $737 | $680 |
| Pupil services | $1,425 | $1,580 | $1,696 |
| Operations and maintenance | $2,033 | $2,918 | $2,004 |
| Insurance, retirement, and other fixed costs | $3,149 | $3,070 | $2,537 |
| Total expenditures per in-district pupil | $22,129 | $22,356 | $21,360 |

*Note*. Any discrepancy between expenditures and total is because of rounding. Expenditures from the School Finance Dashboard sourced from [Resource Allocation and District Action Reports (RADAR)](https://www.doe.mass.edu/research/radar/default.html) last updated April 2025.

Table D6e. Frontier: Expenditures Per In-District Pupil, Fiscal Years 2021-2023

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Expenditure category | FY 2021 | FY 2022 | FY 2023 |
| Administration | $532 | $645 | $727 |
| Instructional leadership (district and school) | $1,066 | $1,211 | $1,275 |
| Teachers | $5,852 | $6,495 | $6,837 |
| Other teaching services | $1,423 | $1,423 | $1,448 |
| Professional development | $88 | $80 | $102 |
| Instructional materials, equipment, and technology | $1,134 | $1,144 | $1,265 |
| Guidance, counseling, and testing services | $726 | $785 | $932 |
| Pupil services | $1,780 | $2,607 | $3,059 |
| Operations and maintenance | $1,811 | $2,013 | $1,950 |
| Insurance, retirement, and other fixed costs | $3,789 | $3,554 | $3,852 |
| Total expenditures per in-district pupil | $18,201 | $19,958 | $21,445 |

*Note*. Any discrepancy between expenditures and total is because of rounding. Expenditures from the School Finance Dashboard sourced from [Resource Allocation and District Action Reports (RADAR)](https://www.doe.mass.edu/research/radar/default.html) last updated April 2025.
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Table E1a. Conway: MCAS ELA Achievement by Student Group, Grades 3-8, 2022-2024

| Group | # included (2024) | % M/E 2022 | % M/E 2023 | % M/E 2024 | % M/E 2024 State | % PME 2022 | % PME 2023 | % PME 2024 | % PME 2024 State | % NM 2022 | % NM 2023 | % NM 2024 | % NM 2024 State |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| All | 82 | 57 | 56 | 39 | 39 | 43 | 38 | 59 | 40 | 0 | 6 | 2 | 21 |
| African American/Black | — | — | — | — | 24 | — | — | — | 46 | — | — | — | 31 |
| Asian | — | — | — | — | 62 | — | — | — | 29 | — | — | — | 10 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 3 | — | — | — | 20 | — | — | — | 44 | — | — | — | 36 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 2 | — | — | — | 46 | — | — | — | 37 | — | — | — | 17 |
| Native American | — | — | — | — | 25 | — | — | — | 43 | — | — | — | 32 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | — | — | — | — | 39 | — | — | — | 39 | — | — | — | 21 |
| White | 77 | 59 | 56 | 40 | 47 | 41 | 37 | 57 | 40 | 0 | 7 | 3 | 13 |
| High needs | 43 | 58 | 49 | 26 | 22 | 43 | 37 | 72 | 45 | 0 | 14 | 2 | 33 |
| Low income | 27 | 59 | 61 | 30 | 21 | 41 | 22 | 67 | 45 | 0 | 17 | 4 | 34 |
| ELs and former ELs | 1 | — | — | — | 17 | — | — | — | 43 | — | — | — | 41 |
| Students w/disabilities | 29 | 45 | 33 | 10 | 11 | 55 | 46 | 86 | 40 | 0 | 21 | 3 | 50 |

Table E1b. Deerfield: MCAS ELA Achievement by Student Group, Grades 3-8, 2022-2024

| Group | # included (2024) | % M/E 2022 | % M/E 2023 | % M/E 2024 | % M/E 2024 State | % PME 2022 | % PME 2023 | % PME 2024 | % PME 2024 State | % NM 2022 | % NM 2023 | % NM 2024 | % NM 2024 State |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| All | 179 | 46 | 44 | 37 | 39 | 47 | 45 | 47 | 40 | 8 | 11 | 16 | 21 |
| African American/Black | 1 | — | — | — | 24 | — | — | — | 46 | — | — | — | 31 |
| Asian | — | — | — | — | 62 | — | — | — | 29 | — | — | — | 10 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 12 | — | 38 | 25 | 20 | — | 62 | 67 | 44 | — | 0 | 8 | 36 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 14 | 46 | 29 | 21 | 46 | 46 | 35 | 50 | 37 | 8 | 35 | 29 | 17 |
| Native American | — | — | — | — | 25 | — | — | — | 43 | — | — | — | 32 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | — | — | — | — | 39 | — | — | — | 39 | — | — | — | 21 |
| White | 152 | 46 | 46 | 39 | 47 | 46 | 45 | 45 | 40 | 8 | 9 | 15 | 13 |
| High needs | 72 | 24 | 20 | 17 | 22 | 58 | 55 | 50 | 45 | 18 | 26 | 33 | 33 |
| Low income | 44 | 25 | 17 | 14 | 21 | 58 | 62 | 66 | 45 | 17 | 21 | 20 | 34 |
| ELs and former ELs | 4 | — | — | — | 17 | — | — | — | 43 | — | — | — | 41 |
| Students w/disabilities | 47 | 14 | 11 | 13 | 11 | 61 | 52 | 43 | 40 | 25 | 36 | 45 | 50 |

Table E1c. Sunderland: MCAS ELA Achievement by Student Group, Grades 3-8, 2022-2024

| Group | # included (2024) | % M/E 2022 | % M/E 2023 | % M/E 2024 | % M/E 2024 State | % PME 2022 | % PME 2023 | % PME 2024 | % PME 2024 State | % NM 2022 | % NM 2023 | % NM 2024 | % NM 2024 State |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| All | 93 | 42 | 47 | 44 | 39 | 46 | 35 | 42 | 40 | 12 | 18 | 14 | 21 |
| African American/Black | 3 | — | — | — | 24 | — | — | — | 46 | — | — | — | 31 |
| Asian | 8 | 73 | — | — | 62 | 27 | — | — | 29 | 0 | — | — | 10 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 12 | 15 | 33 | 25 | 20 | 69 | 42 | 67 | 44 | 15 | 25 | 8 | 36 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 8 | — | — | — | 46 | — | — | — | 37 | — | — | — | 17 |
| Native American | — | — | — | — | 25 | — | — | — | 43 | — | — | — | 32 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | — | — | — | — | 39 | — | — | — | 39 | — | — | — | 21 |
| White | 62 | 46 | 48 | 44 | 47 | 42 | 38 | 44 | 40 | 12 | 14 | 13 | 13 |
| High needs | 48 | 20 | 30 | 25 | 22 | 63 | 36 | 48 | 45 | 17 | 34 | 27 | 33 |
| Low income | 36 | 22 | 32 | 25 | 21 | 64 | 32 | 47 | 45 | 14 | 35 | 28 | 34 |
| ELs and former ELs | 10 | — | — | 40 | 17 | — | — | 50 | 43 | — | — | 10 | 41 |
| Students w/disabilities | 19 | 4 | 6 | 5 | 11 | 64 | 28 | 26 | 40 | 32 | 67 | 68 | 50 |

Table E1d. Whately: MCAS ELA Achievement by Student Group, Grades 3-8, 2022-2024

| Group | # included (2024) | % M/E 2022 | % M/E 2023 | % M/E 2024 | % M/E 2024 State | % PME 2022 | % PME 2023 | % PME 2024 | % PME 2024 State | % NM 2022 | % NM 2023 | % NM 2024 | % NM 2024 State |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| All | 62 | 50 | 53 | 40 | 39 | 43 | 35 | 42 | 40 | 7 | 11 | 18 | 21 |
| African American/Black | 1 | — | — | — | 24 | — | — | — | 46 | — | — | — | 31 |
| Asian | — | — | — | — | 62 | — | — | — | 29 | — | — | — | 10 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 3 | — | — | — | 20 | — | — | — | 44 | — | — | — | 36 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 1 | — | — | — | 46 | — | — | — | 37 | — | — | — | 17 |
| Native American | — | — | — | — | 25 | — | — | — | 43 | — | — | — | 32 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | — | — | — | — | 39 | — | — | — | 39 | — | — | — | 21 |
| White | 57 | 51 | 54 | 40 | 47 | 44 | 35 | 44 | 40 | 5 | 11 | 16 | 13 |
| High needs | 27 | 32 | 35 | 30 | 22 | 53 | 42 | 37 | 45 | 16 | 23 | 33 | 33 |
| Low income | 16 | 36 | 53 | 38 | 21 | 57 | 33 | 25 | 45 | 7 | 13 | 38 | 34 |
| ELs and former ELs | 3 | — | — | — | 17 | — | — | — | 43 | — | — | — | 41 |
| Students w/disabilities | 14 | — | 0 | 0 | 11 | — | 50 | 43 | 40 | — | 50 | 57 | 50 |

Table E1e. Frontier: MCAS ELA Achievement by Student Group, Grades 3-8, 2022-2024

| Group | # included (2024) | % M/E 2022 | % M/E 2023 | % M/E 2024 | % M/E 2024 State | % PME 2022 | % PME 2023 | % PME 2024 | % PME 2024 State | % NM 2022 | % NM 2023 | % NM 2024 | % NM 2024 State |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| All | 229 | 35 | 30 | 31 | 39 | 50 | 46 | 47 | 40 | 15 | 24 | 23 | 21 |
| African American/Black | 3 | — | — | — | 24 | — | — | — | 46 | — | — | — | 31 |
| Asian | 7 | — | — | — | 62 | — | — | — | 29 | — | — | — | 10 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 14 | 6 | 17 | 7 | 20 | 65 | 50 | 29 | 44 | 29 | 33 | 64 | 36 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 18 | 31 | 0 | 22 | 46 | 46 | 55 | 56 | 37 | 23 | 45 | 22 | 17 |
| Native American | — | — | — | — | 25 | — | — | — | 43 | — | — | — | 32 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | — | — | — | — | 39 | — | — | — | 39 | — | — | — | 21 |
| White | 187 | 39 | 32 | 32 | 47 | 49 | 45 | 49 | 40 | 13 | 22 | 19 | 13 |
| High needs | 89 | 12 | 10 | 15 | 22 | 59 | 49 | 44 | 45 | 29 | 41 | 42 | 33 |
| Low income | 69 | 11 | 12 | 17 | 21 | 56 | 49 | 45 | 45 | 33 | 39 | 38 | 34 |
| ELs and former ELs | 1 | — | — | — | 17 | — | — | — | 43 | — | — | — | 41 |
| Students w/disabilities | 43 | 10 | 2 | 2 | 11 | 51 | 41 | 37 | 40 | 39 | 57 | 60 | 50 |

Table E2. Frontier: MCAS ELA Achievement by Student Group, Grade 10, 2022-2024

| Group | # included (2024) | % M/E 2022 | % M/E 2023 | % M/E 2024 | % M/E 2024 State | % PME 2022 | % PME 2023 | % PME 2024 | % PME 2024 State | % NM 2022 | % NM 2023 | % NM 2024 | % NM 2024 State |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| All | 100 | 78 | 63 | 56 | 57 | 20 | 29 | 38 | 31 | 2 | 8 | 6 | 12 |
| African American/Black | 2 | — | — | — | 42 | — | — | — | 40 | — | — | — | 18 |
| Asian | 1 | — | — | — | 78 | — | — | — | 16 | — | — | — | 5 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 11 | — | — | 45 | 36 | — | — | 45 | 38 | — | — | 9 | 26 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 9 | — | — | — | 61 | — | — | — | 30 | — | — | — | 9 |
| Native American | — | — | — | — | 48 | — | — | — | 37 | — | — | — | 14 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | — | — | — | — | 58 | — | — | — | 34 | — | — | — | 8 |
| White | 77 | 78 | 64 | 60 | 65 | 20 | 28 | 35 | 28 | 1 | 8 | 5 | 7 |
| High needs | 29 | 71 | 45 | 28 | 37 | 23 | 37 | 59 | 41 | 6 | 18 | 14 | 23 |
| Low income | 16 | 71 | 48 | 44 | 38 | 23 | 32 | 50 | 40 | 6 | 19 | 6 | 23 |
| ELs and former ELs | — | — | — | — | 14 | — | — | — | 38 | — | — | — | 48 |
| Students w/disabilities | 19 | 43 | 16 | 11 | 21 | 43 | 53 | 68 | 45 | 14 | 32 | 21 | 34 |

Table E3a. Conway: MCAS Mathematics Achievement by Student Group, Grades 3-8, 2022-2024

| Group | # included (2024) | % M/E 2022 | % M/E 2023 | % M/E 2024 | % M/E 2024 State | % PME 2022 | % PME 2023 | % PME 2024 | % PME 2024 State | % NM 2022 | % NM 2023 | % NM 2024 | % NM 2024 State |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| All | 82 | 39 | 55 | 57 | 41 | 55 | 39 | 41 | 42 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 18 |
| African American/Black | — | — | — | — | 22 | — | — | — | 49 | — | — | — | 30 |
| Asian | — | — | — | — | 71 | — | — | — | 23 | — | — | — | 6 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 3 | — | — | — | 20 | — | — | — | 48 | — | — | — | 32 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 2 | — | — | — | 47 | — | — | — | 37 | — | — | — | 16 |
| Native American | — | — | — | — | 27 | — | — | — | 46 | — | — | — | 27 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | — | — | — | — | 39 | — | — | — | 41 | — | — | — | 20 |
| White | 77 | 42 | 55 | 57 | 49 | 54 | 38 | 42 | 40 | 4 | 7 | 1 | 11 |
| High needs | 43 | 41 | 40 | 51 | 23 | 54 | 49 | 47 | 48 | 5 | 11 | 2 | 28 |
| Low income | 27 | 36 | 39 | 52 | 21 | 58 | 57 | 44 | 49 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 30 |
| ELs and former ELs | 1 | — | — | — | 21 | — | — | — | 46 | — | — | — | 33 |
| Students w/disabilities | 29 | 45 | 29 | 41 | 13 | 45 | 54 | 55 | 43 | 9 | 17 | 3 | 44 |

Table E3b. Deerfield: MCAS Mathematics Achievement by Student Group, Grades 3-8, 2022-2024

| Group | # included (2024) | % M/E 2022 | % M/E 2023 | % M/E 2024 | % M/E 2024 State | % PME 2022 | % PME 2023 | % PME 2024 | % PME 2024 State | % NM 2022 | % NM 2023 | % NM 2024 | % NM 2024 State |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| All | 178 | 46 | 43 | 49 | 41 | 43 | 45 | 38 | 42 | 11 | 11 | 13 | 18 |
| African American/Black | 1 | — | — | — | 22 | — | — | — | 49 | — | — | — | 30 |
| Asian | — | — | — | — | 71 | — | — | — | 23 | — | — | — | 6 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 12 | — | 15 | 25 | 20 | — | 62 | 67 | 48 | — | 23 | 8 | 32 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 14 | 38 | 35 | 36 | 47 | 31 | 29 | 36 | 37 | 31 | 35 | 29 | 16 |
| Native American | — | — | — | — | 27 | — | — | — | 46 | — | — | — | 27 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | — | — | — | — | 39 | — | — | — | 41 | — | — | — | 20 |
| White | 151 | 47 | 46 | 52 | 49 | 43 | 46 | 36 | 40 | 10 | 8 | 11 | 11 |
| High needs | 71 | 19 | 17 | 23 | 23 | 54 | 55 | 48 | 48 | 28 | 29 | 30 | 28 |
| Low income | 44 | 17 | 10 | 25 | 21 | 57 | 60 | 55 | 49 | 26 | 31 | 20 | 30 |
| ELs and former ELs | 4 | — | — | — | 21 | — | — | — | 46 | — | — | — | 33 |
| Students w/disabilities | 46 | 10 | 14 | 13 | 13 | 50 | 45 | 48 | 43 | 40 | 41 | 39 | 44 |

Table E3c. Sunderland: MCAS Mathematics Achievement by Student Group, Grades 3-8, 2022-2024

| Group | # included (2024) | % M/E 2022 | % M/E 2023 | % M/E 2024 | % M/E 2024 State | % PME 2022 | % PME 2023 | % PME 2024 | % PME 2024 State | % NM 2022 | % NM 2023 | % NM 2024 | % NM 2024 State |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| All | 93 | 35 | 46 | 43 | 41 | 46 | 40 | 41 | 42 | 19 | 15 | 16 | 18 |
| African American/Black | 3 | — | — | — | 22 | — | — | — | 49 | — | — | — | 30 |
| Asian | 8 | 73 | — | — | 71 | 27 | — | — | 23 | 0 | — | — | 6 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 12 | 8 | 31 | 17 | 20 | 77 | 54 | 67 | 48 | 15 | 15 | 17 | 32 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 8 | — | — | — | 47 | — | — | — | 37 | — | — | — | 16 |
| Native American | — | — | — | — | 27 | — | — | — | 46 | — | — | — | 27 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | — | — | — | — | 39 | — | — | — | 41 | — | — | — | 20 |
| White | 62 | 40 | 47 | 40 | 49 | 44 | 41 | 45 | 40 | 16 | 12 | 15 | 11 |
| High needs | 48 | 17 | 27 | 25 | 23 | 51 | 44 | 46 | 48 | 32 | 29 | 29 | 28 |
| Low income | 36 | 18 | 22 | 19 | 21 | 50 | 47 | 47 | 49 | 32 | 31 | 33 | 30 |
| ELs and former ELs | 10 | — | — | 40 | 21 | — | — | 50 | 46 | — | — | 10 | 33 |
| Students w/disabilities | 19 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 13 | 46 | 42 | 26 | 43 | 54 | 53 | 68 | 44 |

Table E3d. Whately: MCAS Mathematics Achievement by Student Group, Grades 3-8, 2022-2024

| Group | # included (2024) | % M/E 2022 | % M/E 2023 | % M/E 2024 | % M/E 2024 State | % PME 2022 | % PME 2023 | % PME 2024 | % PME 2024 State | % NM 2022 | % NM 2023 | % NM 2024 | % NM 2024 State |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| All | 63 | 71 | 45 | 38 | 41 | 29 | 42 | 56 | 42 | 0 | 13 | 6 | 18 |
| African American/Black | 1 | — | — | — | 22 | — | — | — | 49 | — | — | — | 30 |
| Asian | — | — | — | — | 71 | — | — | — | 23 | — | — | — | 6 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 3 | — | — | — | 20 | — | — | — | 48 | — | — | — | 32 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 1 | — | — | — | 47 | — | — | — | 37 | — | — | — | 16 |
| Native American | — | — | — | — | 27 | — | — | — | 46 | — | — | — | 27 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | — | — | — | — | 39 | — | — | — | 41 | — | — | — | 20 |
| White | 58 | 71 | 44 | 38 | 49 | 29 | 44 | 55 | 40 | 0 | 12 | 7 | 11 |
| High needs | 28 | 42 | 31 | 25 | 23 | 58 | 42 | 61 | 48 | 0 | 27 | 14 | 28 |
| Low income | 16 | 36 | 40 | 25 | 21 | 64 | 47 | 69 | 49 | 0 | 13 | 6 | 30 |
| ELs and former ELs | 3 | — | — | — | 21 | — | — | — | 46 | — | — | — | 33 |
| Students w/disabilities | 15 | — | 8 | 13 | 13 | — | 42 | 60 | 43 | — | 50 | 27 | 44 |

Table E3e. Frontier: MCAS Mathematics Achievement by Student Group, Grades 3-8, 2022-2024

| Group | # included (2024) | % M/E 2022 | % M/E 2023 | % M/E 2024 | % M/E 2024 State | % PME 2022 | % PME 2023 | % PME 2024 | % PME 2024 State | % NM 2022 | % NM 2023 | % NM 2024 | % NM 2024 State |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| All | 232 | 32 | 36 | 42 | 41 | 55 | 51 | 43 | 42 | 13 | 13 | 15 | 18 |
| African American/Black | 3 | — | — | — | 22 | — | — | — | 49 | — | — | — | 30 |
| Asian | 7 | — | — | — | 71 | — | — | — | 23 | — | — | — | 6 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 14 | 26 | 33 | 21 | 20 | 47 | 67 | 43 | 48 | 26 | 0 | 36 | 32 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 18 | 15 | 18 | 56 | 47 | 77 | 55 | 28 | 37 | 8 | 27 | 17 | 16 |
| Native American | — | — | — | — | 27 | — | — | — | 46 | — | — | — | 27 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | — | — | — | — | 39 | — | — | — | 41 | — | — | — | 20 |
| White | 190 | 34 | 37 | 42 | 49 | 54 | 50 | 44 | 40 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 11 |
| High needs | 91 | 18 | 16 | 16 | 23 | 60 | 57 | 54 | 48 | 22 | 27 | 30 | 28 |
| Low income | 70 | 18 | 18 | 19 | 21 | 60 | 57 | 54 | 49 | 22 | 25 | 27 | 30 |
| ELs and former ELs | 1 | — | — | — | 21 | — | — | — | 46 | — | — | — | 33 |
| Students w/disabilities | 45 | 10 | 6 | 7 | 13 | 54 | 56 | 49 | 43 | 36 | 38 | 44 | 44 |

Table E4. Frontier: MCAS Mathematics Achievement by Student Group, Grade 10, 2022-2024

| Group | # included (2024) | % M/E 2022 | % M/E 2023 | % M/E 2024 | % M/E 2024 State | % PME 2022 | % PME 2023 | % PME 2024 | % PME 2024 State | % NM 2022 | % NM 2023 | % NM 2024 | % NM 2024 State |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| All | 99 | 62 | 65 | 52 | 48 | 33 | 29 | 42 | 39 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 13 |
| African American/Black | 2 | — | — | — | 27 | — | — | — | 52 | — | — | — | 21 |
| Asian | 1 | — | — | — | 79 | — | — | — | 17 | — | — | — | 4 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 11 | — | — | 27 | 25 | — | — | 55 | 50 | — | — | 18 | 25 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 8 | — | — | — | 51 | — | — | — | 39 | — | — | — | 10 |
| Native American | — | — | — | — | 33 | — | — | — | 54 | — | — | — | 13 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | — | — | — | — | 52 | — | — | — | 39 | — | — | — | 10 |
| White | 77 | 67 | 65 | 56 | 58 | 30 | 28 | 39 | 35 | 3 | 7 | 5 | 7 |
| High needs | 28 | 47 | 49 | 11 | 27 | 38 | 38 | 71 | 51 | 15 | 14 | 18 | 23 |
| Low income | 16 | 50 | 50 | 13 | 27 | 37 | 37 | 75 | 50 | 13 | 13 | 13 | 23 |
| ELs and former ELs | — | — | — | — | 14 | — | — | — | 46 | — | — | — | 40 |
| Students w/disabilities | 18 | 8 | 26 | 11 | 14 | 54 | 47 | 61 | 51 | 38 | 26 | 28 | 35 |

Table E5a. Conway: MCAS Science Achievement by Student Group, Grades 5 and 8, 2022-2024

| Group | # included (2024) | % M/E 2022 | % M/E 2023 | % M/E 2024 | % M/E 2024 State | % PME 2022 | % PME 2023 | % PME 2024 | % PME 2024 State | % NM 2022 | % NM 2023 | % NM 2024 | % NM 2024 State |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| All | 18 | 62 | 63 | 50 | 42 | 33 | 32 | 50 | 38 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 20 |
| African American/Black | — | — | — | — | 21 | — | — | — | 46 | — | — | — | 33 |
| Asian | — | — | — | — | 64 | — | — | — | 26 | — | — | — | 9 |
| Hispanic/Latino | — | — | — | — | 21 | — | — | — | 43 | — | — | — | 36 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | — | — | — | — | 49 | — | — | — | 34 | — | — | — | 17 |
| Native American | — | — | — | — | 26 | — | — | — | 43 | — | — | — | 32 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | — | — | — | — | 43 | — | — | — | 34 | — | — | — | 23 |
| White | 18 | 68 | 67 | 50 | 51 | 32 | 33 | 50 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| High needs | 12 | — | — | 58 | 24 | — | — | 42 | 44 | — | — | 0 | 32 |
| Low income | 10 | — | — | 70 | 22 | — | — | 30 | 44 | — | — | 0 | 34 |
| ELs and former ELs | — | — | — | — | 17 | — | — | — | 41 | — | — | — | 42 |
| Students w/disabilities | 7 | — | — | — | 15 | — | — | — | 38 | — | — | — | 46 |

Table E5b. Deerfield: MCAS Science Achievement by Student Group, Grades 5 and 8, 2022-2024

| Group | # included (2024) | % M/E 2022 | % M/E 2023 | % M/E 2024 | % M/E 2024 State | % PME 2022 | % PME 2023 | % PME 2024 | % PME 2024 State | % NM 2022 | % NM 2023 | % NM 2024 | % NM 2024 State |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| All | 40 | 68 | 46 | 55 | 42 | 26 | 42 | 38 | 38 | 6 | 12 | 8 | 20 |
| African American/Black | 1 | — | — | — | 21 | — | — | — | 46 | — | — | — | 33 |
| Asian | — | — | — | — | 64 | — | — | — | 26 | — | — | — | 9 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 4 | — | — | — | 21 | — | — | — | 43 | — | — | — | 36 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 3 | — | — | — | 49 | — | — | — | 34 | — | — | — | 17 |
| Native American | — | — | — | — | 26 | — | — | — | 43 | — | — | — | 32 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | — | — | — | — | 43 | — | — | — | 34 | — | — | — | 23 |
| White | 32 | 73 | 47 | 53 | 51 | 24 | 43 | 41 | 36 | 2 | 11 | 6 | 12 |
| High needs | 10 | 56 | 22 | 30 | 24 | 33 | 61 | 50 | 44 | 11 | 17 | 20 | 32 |
| Low income | 6 | 69 | 15 | — | 22 | 23 | 77 | — | 44 | 8 | 8 | — | 34 |
| ELs and former ELs | — | — | — | — | 17 | — | — | — | 41 | — | — | — | 42 |
| Students w/disabilities | 6 | 30 | 19 | — | 15 | 50 | 56 | — | 38 | 20 | 25 | — | 46 |

Table E5c. Sunderland: MCAS Science Achievement by Student Group, Grades 5 and 8, 2022-2024

| Group | # included (2024) | % M/E 2022 | % M/E 2023 | % M/E 2024 | % M/E 2024 State | % PME 2022 | % PME 2023 | % PME 2024 | % PME 2024 State | % NM 2022 | % NM 2023 | % NM 2024 | % NM 2024 State |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| All | 24 | 37 | 44 | 54 | 42 | 44 | 44 | 38 | 38 | 19 | 11 | 8 | 20 |
| African American/Black | 3 | — | — | — | 21 | — | — | — | 46 | — | — | — | 33 |
| Asian | 3 | — | — | — | 64 | — | — | — | 26 | — | — | — | 9 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 5 | — | — | — | 21 | — | — | — | 43 | — | — | — | 36 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 1 | — | — | — | 49 | — | — | — | 34 | — | — | — | 17 |
| Native American | — | — | — | — | 26 | — | — | — | 43 | — | — | — | 32 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | — | — | — | — | 43 | — | — | — | 34 | — | — | — | 23 |
| White | 12 | 40 | 45 | 58 | 51 | 45 | 41 | 42 | 36 | 15 | 14 | 0 | 12 |
| High needs | 11 | 25 | 17 | 18 | 24 | 50 | 58 | 64 | 44 | 25 | 25 | 18 | 32 |
| Low income | 9 | 20 | 10 | — | 22 | 60 | 60 | — | 44 | 20 | 30 | — | 34 |
| ELs and former ELs | 3 | — | — | — | 17 | — | — | — | 41 | — | — | — | 42 |
| Students w/disabilities | 2 | — | — | — | 15 | — | — | — | 38 | — | — | — | 46 |

Table E5d. Whately: MCAS Science Achievement by Student Group, Grades 5 and 8, 2022-2024

| Group | # included (2024) | % M/E 2022 | % M/E 2023 | % M/E 2024 | % M/E 2024 State | % PME 2022 | % PME 2023 | % PME 2024 | % PME 2024 State | % NM 2022 | % NM 2023 | % NM 2024 | % NM 2024 State |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| All | 17 | 81 | 29 | 82 | 42 | 13 | 57 | 18 | 38 | 6 | 14 | 0 | 20 |
| African American/Black | — | — | — | — | 21 | — | — | — | 46 | — | — | — | 33 |
| Asian | — | — | — | — | 64 | — | — | — | 26 | — | — | — | 9 |
| Hispanic/Latino | — | — | — | — | 21 | — | — | — | 43 | — | — | — | 36 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | — | — | — | — | 49 | — | — | — | 34 | — | — | — | 17 |
| Native American | — | — | — | — | 26 | — | — | — | 43 | — | — | — | 32 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | — | — | — | — | 43 | — | — | — | 34 | — | — | — | 23 |
| White | 17 | 80 | 33 | 82 | 51 | 13 | 50 | 18 | 36 | 7 | 17 | 0 | 12 |
| High needs | 5 | — | — | — | 24 | — | — | — | 44 | — | — | — | 32 |
| Low income | 3 | — | — | — | 22 | — | — | — | 44 | — | — | — | 34 |
| ELs and former ELs | — | — | — | — | 17 | — | — | — | 41 | — | — | — | 42 |
| Students w/disabilities | 2 | — | — | — | 15 | — | — | — | 38 | — | — | — | 46 |

Table E5e. Frontier: MCAS Science Achievement by Student Group, Grades 5 and 8, 2022-2024

| Group | # included (2024) | % M/E 2022 | % M/E 2023 | % M/E 2024 | % M/E 2024 State | % PME 2022 | % PME 2023 | % PME 2024 | % PME 2024 State | % NM 2022 | % NM 2023 | % NM 2024 | % NM 2024 State |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| All | 113 | 50 | 39 | 44 | 42 | 39 | 44 | 42 | 38 | 10 | 17 | 14 | 20 |
| African American/Black | 1 | — | — | — | 21 | — | — | — | 46 | — | — | — | 33 |
| Asian | 5 | — | — | — | 64 | — | — | — | 26 | — | — | — | 9 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 5 | 33 | — | — | 21 | 42 | — | — | 43 | 25 | — | — | 36 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 7 | — | — | — | 49 | — | — | — | 34 | — | — | — | 17 |
| Native American | — | — | — | — | 26 | — | — | — | 43 | — | — | — | 32 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | — | — | — | — | 43 | — | — | — | 34 | — | — | — | 23 |
| White | 95 | 55 | 40 | 42 | 51 | 38 | 44 | 45 | 36 | 7 | 16 | 13 | 12 |
| High needs | 43 | 39 | 23 | 19 | 24 | 41 | 46 | 56 | 44 | 20 | 31 | 26 | 32 |
| Low income | 33 | 36 | 28 | 21 | 22 | 36 | 40 | 55 | 44 | 27 | 33 | 24 | 34 |
| ELs and former ELs | 1 | — | — | — | 17 | — | — | — | 41 | — | — | — | 42 |
| Students w/disabilities | 24 | 32 | 14 | 4 | 15 | 45 | 43 | 58 | 38 | 23 | 43 | 38 | 46 |

Table E6. Frontier: MCAS Science Achievement by Student Group, Grade 10, 2022-2024

| Group | # included (2024) | % M/E 2022 | % M/E 2023 | % M/E 2024 | % M/E 2024 State | % PME 2022 | % PME 2023 | % PME 2024 | % PME 2024 State | % NM 2022 | % NM 2023 | % NM 2024 | % NM 2024 State |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| All | 87 | 69 | 58 | 49 | 49 | 26 | 33 | 45 | 40 | 5 | 10 | 6 | 11 |
| African American/Black | 2 | — | — | — | 28 | — | — | — | 53 | — | — | — | 19 |
| Asian | — | — | — | — | 77 | — | — | — | 19 | — | — | — | 5 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 9 | — | — | — | 26 | — | — | — | 52 | — | — | — | 22 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 6 | — | — | — | 53 | — | — | — | 37 | — | — | — | 10 |
| Native American | — | — | — | — | 38 | — | — | — | 53 | — | — | — | 10 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | — | — | — | — | 47 | — | — | — | 45 | — | — | — | 8 |
| White | 70 | 75 | 60 | 56 | 58 | 22 | 31 | 40 | 36 | 3 | 9 | 4 | 6 |
| High needs | 23 | 52 | 44 | 13 | 28 | 34 | 31 | 70 | 52 | 14 | 25 | 17 | 20 |
| Low income | 11 | 54 | 42 | 0 | 28 | 31 | 38 | 91 | 51 | 15 | 19 | 9 | 20 |
| ELs and former ELs | — | — | — | — | 13 | — | — | — | 48 | — | — | — | 39 |
| Students w/disabilities | 16 | 9 | 27 | 19 | 18 | 55 | 27 | 56 | 52 | 36 | 47 | 25 | 31 |

Table E7a. Conway: MCAS ELA Achievement by Grade, 2022-2024

| Grade | # included (2024) | % M/E 2022 | % M/E 2023 | % M/E 2024 | % M/E 2024 State | % PME 2022 | % PME 2023 | % PME 2024 | % PME 2024 State | % NM 2022 | % NM 2023 | % NM 2024 | % NM 2024 State |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3 | 18 | 68 | 67 | 44 | 42 | 32 | 33 | 56 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 |
| 4 | 25 | 47 | 47 | 32 | 37 | 53 | 47 | 60 | 45 | 0 | 6 | 8 | 19 |
| 5 | 18 | 43 | 63 | 44 | 38 | 57 | 37 | 56 | 46 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| 6 | 21 | 70 | 45 | 38 | 40 | 30 | 35 | 62 | 35 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 25 |
| 7 | — | — | — | — | 36 | — | — | — | 42 | — | — | — | 22 |
| 8 | — | — | — | — | 43 | — | — | — | 34 | — | — | — | 24 |
| 3-8 | 82 | 57 | 56 | 39 | 39 | 43 | 38 | 59 | 40 | 0 | 6 | 2 | 21 |

Table E7b. Deerfield: MCAS ELA Achievement by Grade, 2022-2024

| Grade | # included (2024) | % M/E 2022 | % M/E 2023 | % M/E 2024 | % M/E 2024 State | % PME 2022 | % PME 2023 | % PME 2024 | % PME 2024 State | % NM 2022 | % NM 2023 | % NM 2024 | % NM 2024 State |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3 | 31 | 50 | 36 | 32 | 42 | 48 | 53 | 48 | 40 | 3 | 11 | 19 | 18 |
| 4 | 57 | 40 | 65 | 33 | 37 | 46 | 30 | 54 | 45 | 14 | 5 | 12 | 19 |
| 5 | 40 | 59 | 35 | 50 | 38 | 39 | 52 | 38 | 46 | 2 | 13 | 13 | 16 |
| 6 | 51 | 31 | 47 | 33 | 40 | 56 | 41 | 45 | 35 | 13 | 12 | 22 | 25 |
| 7 | — | — | — | — | 36 | — | — | — | 42 | — | — | — | 22 |
| 8 | — | — | — | — | 43 | — | — | — | 34 | — | — | — | 24 |
| 3-8 | 179 | 46 | 44 | 37 | 39 | 47 | 45 | 47 | 40 | 8 | 11 | 16 | 21 |

Table E7c. Sunderland: MCAS ELA Achievement by Grade, 2022-2024

| Grade | # included (2024) | % M/E 2022 | % M/E 2023 | % M/E 2024 | % M/E 2024 State | % PME 2022 | % PME 2023 | % PME 2024 | % PME 2024 State | % NM 2022 | % NM 2023 | % NM 2024 | % NM 2024 State |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3 | 14 | 56 | 57 | 64 | 42 | 41 | 33 | 29 | 40 | 4 | 10 | 7 | 18 |
| 4 | 24 | 32 | 61 | 29 | 37 | 60 | 22 | 46 | 45 | 8 | 17 | 25 | 19 |
| 5 | 26 | 33 | 37 | 50 | 38 | 52 | 44 | 42 | 46 | 15 | 19 | 8 | 16 |
| 6 | 29 | 45 | 38 | 41 | 40 | 36 | 38 | 45 | 35 | 18 | 25 | 14 | 25 |
| 7 | — | — | — | — | 36 | — | — | — | 42 | — | — | — | 22 |
| 8 | — | — | — | — | 43 | — | — | — | 34 | — | — | — | 24 |
| 3-8 | 93 | 42 | 47 | 44 | 39 | 46 | 35 | 42 | 40 | 12 | 18 | 14 | 21 |

Table E7d. Whately: MCAS ELA Achievement by Grade, 2022-2024

| Grade | # included (2024) | % M/E 2022 | % M/E 2023 | % M/E 2024 | % M/E 2024 State | % PME 2022 | % PME 2023 | % PME 2024 | % PME 2024 State | % NM 2022 | % NM 2023 | % NM 2024 | % NM 2024 State |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3 | 17 | 38 | 33 | 24 | 42 | 63 | 40 | 53 | 40 | 0 | 27 | 24 | 18 |
| 4 | 15 | 36 | 65 | 47 | 37 | 43 | 29 | 40 | 45 | 21 | 6 | 13 | 19 |
| 5 | 17 | 63 | 43 | 47 | 38 | 38 | 43 | 47 | 46 | 0 | 14 | 6 | 16 |
| 6 | 13 | 67 | 69 | 46 | 40 | 25 | 31 | 23 | 35 | 8 | 0 | 31 | 25 |
| 7 | — | — | — | — | 36 | — | — | — | 42 | — | — | — | 22 |
| 8 | — | — | — | — | 43 | — | — | — | 34 | — | — | — | 24 |
| 3-8 | 62 | 50 | 53 | 40 | 39 | 43 | 35 | 42 | 40 | 7 | 11 | 18 | 21 |

Table E7e. Frontier: MCAS ELA Achievement by Grade, 2022-2024

| Grade | # included (2024) | % M/E 2022 | % M/E 2023 | % M/E 2024 | % M/E 2024 State | % PME 2022 | % PME 2023 | % PME 2024 | % PME 2024 State | % NM 2022 | % NM 2023 | % NM 2024 | % NM 2024 State |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 7 | 116 | 28 | 34 | 28 | 36 | 52 | 50 | 49 | 42 | 20 | 15 | 23 | 22 |
| 8 | 113 | 41 | 26 | 34 | 43 | 49 | 42 | 44 | 34 | 11 | 32 | 22 | 24 |
| 3-8 | 229 | 35 | 30 | 31 | 39 | 50 | 46 | 47 | 40 | 15 | 24 | 23 | 21 |
| 10 | 100 | 78 | 63 | 56 | 57 | 20 | 29 | 38 | 31 | 2 | 8 | 6 | 12 |

Table E8a. Conway: MCAS Mathematics Achievement by Grade, 2022-2024

| Grade | # included (2024) | % M/E 2022 | % M/E 2023 | % M/E 2024 | % M/E 2024 State | % PME 2022 | % PME 2023 | % PME 2024 | % PME 2024 State | % NM 2022 | % NM 2023 | % NM 2024 | % NM 2024 State |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3 | 18 | 37 | 71 | 61 | 44 | 63 | 24 | 39 | 35 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 20 |
| 4 | 25 | 38 | 35 | 60 | 46 | 50 | 47 | 36 | 38 | 13 | 18 | 4 | 16 |
| 5 | 18 | 33 | 58 | 44 | 40 | 62 | 42 | 56 | 46 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| 6 | 21 | 50 | 50 | 62 | 40 | 45 | 45 | 38 | 43 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 17 |
| 7 | — | — | — | — | 37 | — | — | — | 44 | — | — | — | 19 |
| 8 | — | — | — | — | 38 | — | — | — | 42 | — | — | — | 19 |
| 3-8 | 82 | 39 | 55 | 57 | 41 | 55 | 39 | 41 | 42 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 18 |

Table E8b. Deerfield: MCAS Mathematics Achievement by Grade, 2022-2024

| Grade | # included (2024) | % M/E 2022 | % M/E 2023 | % M/E 2024 | % M/E 2024 State | % PME 2022 | % PME 2023 | % PME 2024 | % PME 2024 State | % NM 2022 | % NM 2023 | % NM 2024 | % NM 2024 State |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3 | 30 | 64 | 29 | 57 | 44 | 26 | 58 | 33 | 35 | 10 | 13 | 10 | 20 |
| 4 | 57 | 39 | 60 | 51 | 46 | 47 | 35 | 40 | 38 | 14 | 5 | 9 | 16 |
| 5 | 40 | 49 | 38 | 45 | 40 | 41 | 44 | 45 | 46 | 10 | 17 | 10 | 14 |
| 6 | 51 | 33 | 51 | 45 | 40 | 56 | 41 | 33 | 43 | 10 | 8 | 22 | 17 |
| 7 | — | — | — | — | 37 | — | — | — | 44 | — | — | — | 19 |
| 8 | — | — | — | — | 38 | — | — | — | 42 | — | — | — | 19 |
| 3-8 | 178 | 46 | 43 | 49 | 41 | 43 | 45 | 38 | 42 | 11 | 11 | 13 | 18 |

Table E8c. Sunderland: MCAS Mathematics Achievement by Grade, 2022-2024

| Grade | # included (2024) | % M/E 2022 | % M/E 2023 | % M/E 2024 | % M/E 2024 State | % PME 2022 | % PME 2023 | % PME 2024 | % PME 2024 State | % NM 2022 | % NM 2023 | % NM 2024 | % NM 2024 State |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3 | 14 | 48 | 67 | 71 | 44 | 37 | 14 | 14 | 35 | 15 | 19 | 14 | 20 |
| 4 | 24 | 32 | 48 | 38 | 46 | 48 | 35 | 38 | 38 | 20 | 17 | 25 | 16 |
| 5 | 26 | 11 | 33 | 46 | 40 | 63 | 48 | 46 | 46 | 26 | 19 | 8 | 14 |
| 6 | 29 | 47 | 40 | 31 | 40 | 38 | 56 | 52 | 43 | 16 | 4 | 17 | 17 |
| 7 | — | — | — | — | 37 | — | — | — | 44 | — | — | — | 19 |
| 8 | — | — | — | — | 38 | — | — | — | 42 | — | — | — | 19 |
| 3-8 | 93 | 35 | 46 | 43 | 41 | 46 | 40 | 41 | 42 | 19 | 15 | 16 | 18 |

Table E8d. Whately: MCAS Mathematics Achievement by Grade, 2022-2024

| Grade | # included (2024) | % M/E 2022 | % M/E 2023 | % M/E 2024 | % M/E 2024 State | % PME 2022 | % PME 2023 | % PME 2024 | % PME 2024 State | % NM 2022 | % NM 2023 | % NM 2024 | % NM 2024 State |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3 | 17 | 69 | 0 | 35 | 44 | 31 | 60 | 59 | 35 | 0 | 40 | 6 | 20 |
| 4 | 16 | 64 | 65 | 25 | 46 | 36 | 29 | 63 | 38 | 0 | 6 | 13 | 16 |
| 5 | 17 | 69 | 36 | 53 | 40 | 31 | 57 | 47 | 46 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 14 |
| 6 | 13 | 83 | 75 | 38 | 40 | 17 | 25 | 54 | 43 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 17 |
| 7 | — | — | — | — | 37 | — | — | — | 44 | — | — | — | 19 |
| 8 | — | — | — | — | 38 | — | — | — | 42 | — | — | — | 19 |
| 3-8 | 63 | 71 | 45 | 38 | 41 | 29 | 42 | 56 | 42 | 0 | 13 | 6 | 18 |

Table E8e. Frontier: MCAS Mathematics Achievement by Grade, 2022-2024

| Grade | # included (2024) | % M/E 2022 | % M/E 2023 | % M/E 2024 | % M/E 2024 State | % PME 2022 | % PME 2023 | % PME 2024 | % PME 2024 State | % NM 2022 | % NM 2023 | % NM 2024 | % NM 2024 State |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 7 | 118 | 25 | 40 | 40 | 37 | 59 | 46 | 42 | 44 | 16 | 13 | 19 | 19 |
| 8 | 114 | 38 | 31 | 45 | 38 | 52 | 56 | 44 | 42 | 11 | 13 | 11 | 19 |
| 3-8 | 232 | 32 | 36 | 42 | 41 | 55 | 51 | 43 | 42 | 13 | 13 | 15 | 18 |
| 10 | 99 | 62 | 65 | 52 | 48 | 33 | 29 | 42 | 39 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 13 |

Table E9a. Conway: MCAS Science Achievement by Grade, 2022-2024

| Grade | # included (2024) | % M/E 2022 | % M/E 2023 | % M/E 2024 | % M/E 2024 State | % PME 2022 | % PME 2023 | % PME 2024 | % PME 2024 State | % NM 2022 | % NM 2023 | % NM 2024 | % NM 2024 State |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 5 | 18 | 62 | 63 | 50 | 45 | 33 | 32 | 50 | 36 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 20 |
| 8 | — | — | — | — | 39 | — | — | — | 41 | — | — | — | 20 |
| 5 and 8 | 18 | 62 | 63 | 50 | 42 | 33 | 32 | 50 | 38 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 20 |

Table E9b. Deerfield: MCAS Science Achievement by Grade, 2022-2024

| Grade | # included (2024) | % M/E 2022 | % M/E 2023 | % M/E 2024 | % M/E 2024 State | % PME 2022 | % PME 2023 | % PME 2024 | % PME 2024 State | % NM 2022 | % NM 2023 | % NM 2024 | % NM 2024 State |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 5 | 40 | 68 | 46 | 55 | 45 | 26 | 42 | 38 | 36 | 6 | 12 | 8 | 20 |
| 8 | — | — | — | — | 39 | — | — | — | 41 | — | — | — | 20 |
| 5 and 8 | 40 | 68 | 46 | 55 | 42 | 26 | 42 | 38 | 38 | 6 | 12 | 8 | 20 |

Table E9c. Sunderland: MCAS Science Achievement by Grade, 2022-2024

| Grade | # included (2024) | % M/E 2022 | % M/E 2023 | % M/E 2024 | % M/E 2024 State | % PME 2022 | % PME 2023 | % PME 2024 | % PME 2024 State | % NM 2022 | % NM 2023 | % NM 2024 | % NM 2024 State |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 5 | 24 | 37 | 44 | 54 | 45 | 44 | 44 | 38 | 36 | 19 | 11 | 8 | 20 |
| 8 | — | — | — | — | 39 | — | — | — | 41 | — | — | — | 20 |
| 5 and 8 | 24 | 37 | 44 | 54 | 42 | 44 | 44 | 38 | 38 | 19 | 11 | 8 | 20 |

Table E9d. Whately: MCAS Science Achievement by Grade, 2022-2024

| Grade | # included (2024) | % M/E 2022 | % M/E 2023 | % M/E 2024 | % M/E 2024 State | % PME 2022 | % PME 2023 | % PME 2024 | % PME 2024 State | % NM 2022 | % NM 2023 | % NM 2024 | % NM 2024 State |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 5 | 17 | 81 | 29 | 82 | 45 | 13 | 57 | 18 | 36 | 6 | 14 | 0 | 20 |
| 8 | — | — | — | — | 39 | — | — | — | 41 | — | — | — | 20 |
| 5 and 8 | 17 | 81 | 29 | 82 | 42 | 13 | 57 | 18 | 38 | 6 | 14 | 0 | 20 |

Table E9e. Frontier: MCAS Science Achievement by Grade, 2022-2024

| Grade | # included (2024) | % M/E 2022 | % M/E 2023 | % M/E 2024 | % M/E 2024 State | % PME 2022 | % PME 2023 | % PME 2024 | % PME 2024 State | % NM 2022 | % NM 2023 | % NM 2024 | % NM 2024 State |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 5 | — | — | — | — | 45 | — | — | — | 36 | — | — | — | 20 |
| 8 | 113 | 50 | 39 | 44 | 39 | 39 | 44 | 42 | 41 | 10 | 17 | 14 | 20 |
| 5 and 8 | 113 | 50 | 39 | 44 | 42 | 39 | 44 | 42 | 38 | 10 | 17 | 14 | 20 |
| 10 | 87 | 69 | 58 | 49 | 49 | 26 | 33 | 45 | 40 | 5 | 10 | 6 | 11 |

Table E10a. Conway: MCAS ELA Mean Student Growth Percentile by Student Group, Grades 3-8, 2022-2024

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | # included (2024) | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | State (2024) |
| All students | 57 | 53 | 49 | 44 | 50 |
| African American/Black | — | — | — | — | 49 |
| Asian | — | — | — | — | 57 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 1 | — | — | — | 48 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 1 | — | — | — | 51 |
| Native American | — | — | — | — | 48 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | — | — | — | — | 51 |
| White | 55 | 55 | 47 | 44 | 50 |
| High needs | 30 | 52 | 36 | 44 | 48 |
| Low income | 19 | — | — | — | 47 |
| ELs and former ELs | — | — | — | — | 50 |
| Students w/disabilities | 21 | — | — | 35 | 45 |

Table E10b. Deerfield: MCAS ELA Mean Student Growth Percentile by Student Group, Grades 3-8, 2022-2024

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | # included (2024) | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | State (2024) |
| All students | 137 | 53 | 46 | 55 | 50 |
| African American/Black | — | — | — | — | 49 |
| Asian | — | — | — | — | 57 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 11 | — | — | — | 48 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 9 | — | — | — | 51 |
| Native American | — | — | — | — | 48 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | — | — | — | — | 51 |
| White | 117 | 53 | 46 | 56 | 50 |
| High needs | 57 | 48 | 37 | 54 | 48 |
| Low income | 35 | 49 | 40 | 53 | 47 |
| ELs and former ELs | 4 | — | — | — | 50 |
| Students w/disabilities | 38 | 44 | 28 | 54 | 45 |

Table E10c. Sunderland: MCAS ELA Mean Student Growth Percentile by Student Group, Grades 3-8, 2022-2024

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | # included (2024) | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | State (2024) |
| All students | 73 | 44 | 44 | 46 | 50 |
| African American/Black | 2 | — | — | — | 49 |
| Asian | 6 | — | — | — | 57 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 9 | — | — | — | 48 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 6 | — | — | — | 51 |
| Native American | — | — | — | — | 48 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | — | — | — | — | 51 |
| White | 50 | 43 | 46 | 46 | 50 |
| High needs | 36 | 38 | 40 | 41 | 48 |
| Low income | 28 | 39 | 34 | 41 | 47 |
| ELs and former ELs | 8 | — | — | — | 50 |
| Students w/disabilities | 14 | — | — | — | 45 |

Table E10d. Whately: MCAS ELA Mean Student Growth Percentile by Student Group, Grades 3-8, 2022-2024

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | # included (2024) | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | State (2024) |
| All students | 44 | 54 | 60 | 56 | 50 |
| African American/Black | — | — | — | — | 49 |
| Asian | — | — | — | — | 57 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 2 | — | — | — | 48 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 1 | — | — | — | 51 |
| Native American | — | — | — | — | 48 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | — | — | — | — | 51 |
| White | 41 | 55 | 60 | 54 | 50 |
| High needs | 20 | — | — | 56 | 48 |
| Low income | 10 | — | — | — | 47 |
| ELs and former ELs | 2 | — | — | — | 50 |
| Students w/disabilities | 11 | — | — | — | 45 |

Table E10e. Frontier: MCAS ELA Mean Student Growth Percentile by Student Group, Grades 3-8, 2022-2024

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | # included (2024) | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | State (2024) |
| All students | 218 | 43 | 38 | 35 | 50 |
| African American/Black | 2 | — | — | — | 49 |
| Asian | 7 | — | — | — | 57 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 11 | — | — | — | 48 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 17 | — | — | — | 51 |
| Native American | — | — | — | — | 48 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | — | — | — | — | 51 |
| White | 181 | 42 | 38 | 35 | 50 |
| High needs | 81 | 39 | 38 | 37 | 48 |
| Low income | 64 | 37 | 38 | 37 | 47 |
| ELs and former ELs | 1 | — | — | — | 50 |
| Students w/disabilities | 38 | 37 | 38 | 34 | 45 |

Table E11. Frontier: MCAS ELA Mean Student Growth Percentile by Student Group, Grade 10, 2022-2024

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | # included (2024) | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | State (2024) |
| All students | 90 | 63 | 42 | 41 | 50 |
| African American/Black | 2 | — | — | — | 48 |
| Asian | — | — | — | — | 55 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 9 | — | — | — | 47 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 7 | — | — | — | 50 |
| Native American | — | — | — | — | 51 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | — | — | — | — | 49 |
| White | 72 | 60 | 42 | 43 | 51 |
| High needs | 24 | 66 | 40 | 36 | 47 |
| Low income | 13 | 62 | 45 | — | 47 |
| ELs and former ELs | — | — | — | — | 48 |
| Students w/disabilities | 15 | — | — | — | 44 |

Table E12a. Conway: MCAS Mathematics Mean Student Growth Percentile by Student Group, Grades 3-8, 2022-2024

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | # included (2024) | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | State (2024) |
| All students | 57 | 37 | 52 | 44 | 50 |
| African American/Black | — | — | — | — | 49 |
| Asian | — | — | — | — | 58 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 1 | — | — | — | 48 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 1 | — | — | — | 50 |
| Native American | — | — | — | — | 48 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | — | — | — | — | 52 |
| White | 55 | 37 | 50 | 45 | 50 |
| High needs | 30 | 34 | 42 | 45 | 48 |
| Low income | 19 | — | — | — | 47 |
| ELs and former ELs | — | — | — | — | 50 |
| Students w/disabilities | 21 | — | — | 36 | 46 |

Table E12b. Deerfield: MCAS Mathematics Mean Student Growth Percentile by Student Group, Grades 3-8, 2022-2024

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | # included (2024) | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | State (2024) |
| All students | 137 | 52 | 51 | 51 | 50 |
| African American/Black | — | — | — | — | 49 |
| Asian | — | — | — | — | 58 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 11 | — | — | — | 48 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 9 | — | — | — | 50 |
| Native American | — | — | — | — | 48 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | — | — | — | — | 52 |
| White | 117 | 52 | 51 | 52 | 50 |
| High needs | 57 | 48 | 45 | 48 | 48 |
| Low income | 35 | 49 | 45 | 48 | 47 |
| ELs and former ELs | 4 | — | — | — | 50 |
| Students w/disabilities | 38 | 49 | 42 | 47 | 46 |

Table E12c. Sunderland: MCAS Mathematics Mean Student Growth Percentile by Student Group, Grades 3-8, 2022-2024

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | # included (2024) | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | State (2024) |
| All students | 73 | 40 | 55 | 42 | 50 |
| African American/Black | 2 | — | — | — | 49 |
| Asian | 6 | — | — | — | 58 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 9 | — | — | — | 48 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 6 | — | — | — | 50 |
| Native American | — | — | — | — | 48 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | — | — | — | — | 52 |
| White | 50 | 43 | 56 | 44 | 50 |
| High needs | 36 | 37 | 49 | 37 | 48 |
| Low income | 28 | 38 | 49 | 37 | 47 |
| ELs and former ELs | 8 | — | — | — | 50 |
| Students w/disabilities | 14 | — | — | — | 46 |

Table E12d. Whately: MCAS Mathematics Mean Student Growth Percentile by Student Group, Grades 3-8, 2022-2024

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | # included (2024) | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | State (2024) |
| All students | 45 | 59 | 45 | 57 | 50 |
| African American/Black | — | — | — | — | 49 |
| Asian | — | — | — | — | 58 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 2 | — | — | — | 48 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 1 | — | — | — | 50 |
| Native American | — | — | — | — | 48 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | — | — | — | — | 52 |
| White | 42 | 58 | 44 | 57 | 50 |
| High needs | 21 | — | — | 63 | 48 |
| Low income | 10 | — | — | — | 47 |
| ELs and former ELs | 2 | — | — | — | 50 |
| Students w/disabilities | 12 | — | — | — | 46 |

Table E12e. Frontier: MCAS Mathematics Mean Student Growth Percentile by Student Group, Grades 3-8, 2022-2024

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | # included (2024) | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | State (2024) |
| All students | 221 | 44 | 51 | 47 | 50 |
| African American/Black | 2 | — | — | — | 49 |
| Asian | 7 | — | — | — | 58 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 12 | — | — | — | 48 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 17 | — | — | — | 50 |
| Native American | — | — | — | — | 48 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | — | — | — | — | 52 |
| White | 183 | 45 | 51 | 46 | 50 |
| High needs | 83 | 48 | 47 | 45 | 48 |
| Low income | 66 | 51 | 46 | 44 | 47 |
| ELs and former ELs | 1 | — | — | — | 50 |
| Students w/disabilities | 40 | 44 | 51 | 45 | 46 |

Table E13. Frontier: MCAS Mathematics Mean Student Growth Percentile by Student Group, Grade 10, 2022-2024

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | # included (2024) | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | State (2024) |
| All students | 88 | 65 | 53 | 47 | 50 |
| African American/Black | 2 | — | — | — | 47 |
| Asian | — | — | — | — | 55 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 9 | — | — | — | 45 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 6 | — | — | — | 49 |
| Native American | — | — | — | — | 50 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | — | — | — | — | 50 |
| White | 71 | 63 | 53 | 48 | 52 |
| High needs | 23 | 66 | 43 | 37 | 47 |
| Low income | 13 | 65 | 44 | — | 46 |
| ELs and former ELs | — | — | — | — | 46 |
| Students w/disabilities | 14 | — | — | — | 47 |

Table E14a. Conway: MCAS ELA Mean Student Growth Percentile by Grade, 2022-2024

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade | # included (2024) | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | State (2024) |
| 3 | — | — | — | — | — |
| 4 | 20 | — | — | 33 | 50 |
| 5 | 17 | 50 | — | — | 50 |
| 6 | 20 | 67 | — | 45 | 50 |
| 7 | — | — | — | — | 50 |
| 8 | — | — | — | — | 50 |
| 3-8 | 57 | 53 | 49 | 44 | 50 |

Table E14b. Deerfield: MCAS ELA Mean Student Growth Percentile by Grade, 2022-2024

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade | # included (2024) | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | State (2024) |
| 3 | — | — | — | — | — |
| 4 | 54 | 52 | 58 | 58 | 50 |
| 5 | 37 | 62 | 40 | 44 | 50 |
| 6 | 46 | 43 | 42 | 62 | 50 |
| 7 | — | — | — | — | 50 |
| 8 | — | — | — | — | 50 |
| 3-8 | 137 | 53 | 46 | 55 | 50 |

Table E14c. Sunderland: MCAS ELA Mean Student Growth Percentile by Grade, 2022-2024

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade | # included (2024) | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | State (2024) |
| 3 | — | — | — | — | — |
| 4 | 24 | 39 | 49 | 33 | 50 |
| 5 | 23 | 39 | 37 | 40 | 50 |
| 6 | 26 | 53 | 47 | 64 | 50 |
| 7 | — | — | — | — | 50 |
| 8 | — | — | — | — | 50 |
| 3-8 | 73 | 44 | 44 | 46 | 50 |

Table E14d. Whately: MCAS ELA Mean Student Growth Percentile by Grade, 2022-2024

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade | # included (2024) | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | State (2024) |
| 3 | — | — | — | — | — |
| 4 | 14 | — | — | — | 50 |
| 5 | 17 | — | — | — | 50 |
| 6 | 13 | — | — | — | 50 |
| 7 | — | — | — | — | 50 |
| 8 | — | — | — | — | 50 |
| 3-8 | 44 | 54 | 60 | 56 | 50 |

Table E14e. Frontier: MCAS ELA Mean Student Growth Percentile by Grade, 2022-2024

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade | # included (2024) | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | State (2024) |
| 7 | 109 | 40 | 40 | 34 | 50 |
| 8 | 109 | 45 | 36 | 37 | 50 |
| 3-8 | 218 | 43 | 38 | 35 | 50 |
| 10 | 90 | 63 | 42 | 41 | 50 |

Table E15a. Conway: MCAS Mathematics Mean Student Growth Percentile by Grade, 2022-2024

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade | # included (2024) | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | State (2024) |
| 3 | — | — | — | — | — |
| 4 | 20 | — | — | 24 | 50 |
| 5 | 17 | 54 | — | — | 50 |
| 6 | 20 | 31 | — | 46 | 50 |
| 7 | — | — | — | — | 50 |
| 8 | — | — | — | — | 50 |
| 3-8 | 57 | 37 | 52 | 44 | 50 |

Table E15b. Deerfield: MCAS Mathematics Mean Student Growth Percentile by Grade, 2022-2024

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade | # included (2024) | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | State (2024) |
| 3 | — | — | — | — | — |
| 4 | 54 | 51 | 58 | 56 | 50 |
| 5 | 37 | 52 | 46 | 28 | 50 |
| 6 | 46 | 52 | 49 | 63 | 50 |
| 7 | — | — | — | — | 50 |
| 8 | — | — | — | — | 50 |
| 3-8 | 137 | 52 | 51 | 51 | 50 |

Table E15c. Sunderland: MCAS Mathematics Mean Student Growth Percentile by Grade, 2022-2024

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade | # included (2024) | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | State (2024) |
| 3 | — | — | — | — | — |
| 4 | 24 | 37 | 51 | 32 | 50 |
| 5 | 23 | 36 | 34 | 48 | 50 |
| 6 | 26 | 47 | 82 | 47 | 50 |
| 7 | — | — | — | — | 50 |
| 8 | — | — | — | — | 50 |
| 3-8 | 73 | 40 | 55 | 42 | 50 |

Table E15d. Whately: MCAS Mathematics Mean Student Growth Percentile by Grade, 2022-2024

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade | # included (2024) | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | State (2024) |
| 3 | — | — | — | — | — |
| 4 | 15 | — | — | — | 50 |
| 5 | 17 | — | — | — | 50 |
| 6 | 13 | — | — | — | 50 |
| 7 | — | — | — | — | 50 |
| 8 | — | — | — | — | 50 |
| 3-8 | 45 | 59 | 45 | 57 | 50 |

Table E15e. Frontier: MCAS Mathematics Mean Student Growth Percentile by Grade, 2022-2024

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade | # included (2024) | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | State (2024) |
| 7 | 111 | 45 | 52 | 45 | 50 |
| 8 | 110 | 44 | 49 | 50 | 50 |
| 3-8 | 221 | 44 | 51 | 47 | 50 |
| 10 | 88 | 65 | 53 | 47 | 50 |

Table E16. Frontier: Four-Year Cohort Graduation Rates by Student Group, 2021-2023

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | # included (2023) | 2021 (%) | 2022 (%) | 2023 (%) | State 2023 (%) |
| All | 92 | 90.7 | 88.2 | 92.4 | 89.2 |
| African American/Black | 1 |  | — | — | 85.6 |
| Asian | 1 |  | — | — | 95.2 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 8 |  | 66.7 | 62.5 | 78.9 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 2 |  | — | — | 89.3 |
| Native American | — | — | — | — | 82.5 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | — | — | — | — | 89.9 |
| White | 80 | 92.4 | 89.0 | 95.0 | 93.0 |
| High needs | 34 | 76.5 | 80.0 | 88.2 | 82.8 |
| Low income | 30 | 79.2 | 84.6 | 86.7 | 82.2 |
| English learners | 1 | — | — | — | 67.3 |
| Students w/disabilities | 13 | 68.4 | 70.8 | 76.9 | 76.4 |

Table E17. Frontier: Five-Year Cohort Graduation Rates by Student Group, 2020-2022

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | # included (2022) | 2020 (%) | 2021 (%) | 2022 (%) | State 2022 (%) |
| All | 102 | 94.1 | 92.5 | 89.2 | 91.9 |
| African American/Black | 1 | — |  | — | 90.1 |
| Asian | 1 | — |  | — | 96.9 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 6 | — |  | 66.7 | 84.4 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 2 | — |  | — | 90.8 |
| Native American | — | — | — | — | 87.1 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | 1 | — | — | — | 81.3 |
| White | 91 | 94.4 | 93.5 | 90.1 | 94.4 |
| High needs | 50 | 86.0 | 82.4 | 82.0 | 86.8 |
| Low income | 39 | 93.1 | 79.2 | 87.2 | 86.3 |
| English learners | — | — | — | — | 78.0 |
| Students w/disabilities | 24 | 80.8 | 78.9 | 75.0 | 81.8 |

Table E18. Frontier: Annual Dropout Rates by Student Group, 2021-2023

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | # included (2023) | 2021 (%) | 2022 (%) | 2023 (%) | State 2023 (%) |
| All | 379 | 1.2 | 1.3 | 0.5 | 2.1 |
| African American/Black | 8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.8 |
| Asian | 14 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.6 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 26 | 5.0 | 4.2 | 0.0 | 4.4 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 17 | 0.0 | 7.7 | 0.0 | 1.9 |
| Native American | — | — | — | — | 4.1 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | — | — | — | — | 3.9 |
| White | 314 | 1.2 | 0.9 | 0.6 | 1.1 |
| High needs | 116 | 2.6 | 2.2 | 1.7 | 3.5 |
| Low income | 85 | — | 1.9 | 2.4 | 3.8 |
| English learners | 2 | — | — | — | 8.0 |
| Students w/disabilities | 55 | 3.6 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 3.0 |

Table E19a. Conway: In-School Suspension Rates by Student Group, 2022-2024

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | # included (2024) | 2022 (%) | 2023 (%) | 2024 (%) | State 2024 (%) |
| All | 149 | — | — | — | 1.4 |
| African American/Black | 0 | — | — | — | 2.1 |
| Asian | 0 | — | — | — | 0.3 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 6 | — | — | — | 1.9 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 6 | — | — | — | 1.6 |
| Native American | 0 | — | — | — | 1.8 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | 0 | — | — | — | 1.9 |
| White | 137 | — | — | — | 1.1 |
| High needs | 70 | — | — | — | 1.9 |
| Low income | 45 | — | — | — | 2.1 |
| English learners | 1 | — | — | — | 1.4 |
| Students w/disabilities | 40 | — | — | — | 2.4 |

Table E19b. Deerfield: In-School Suspension Rates by Student Group, 2022-2024

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | # included (2024) | 2022 (%) | 2023 (%) | 2024 (%) | State 2024 (%) |
| All | 319 | — | — | — | 1.4 |
| African American/Black | 5 | — | — | — | 2.1 |
| Asian | 2 | — | — | — | 0.3 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 16 | — | — | — | 1.9 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 18 | — | — | — | 1.6 |
| Native American | 0 | — | — | — | 1.8 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | 0 | — | — | — | 1.9 |
| White | 278 | — | — | — | 1.1 |
| High needs | 135 | — | — | — | 1.9 |
| Low income | 82 | — | — | — | 2.1 |
| English learners | 4 | — | — | — | 1.4 |
| Students w/disabilities | 83 | — | — | — | 2.4 |

Table E19c. Sunderland: In-School Suspension Rates by Student Group, 2022-2024

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | # included (2024) | 2022 (%) | 2023 (%) | 2024 (%) | State 2024 (%) |
| All | 190 | — | — | — | 1.4 |
| African American/Black | 6 | — | — | — | 2.1 |
| Asian | 18 | — | — | — | 0.3 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 25 | — | — | — | 1.9 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 15 | — | — | — | 1.6 |
| Native American | 0 | — | — | — | 1.8 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | 0 | — | — | — | 1.9 |
| White | 126 | — | — | — | 1.1 |
| High needs | 105 | — | — | — | 1.9 |
| Low income | 75 | — | — | — | 2.1 |
| English learners | 14 | — | — | — | 1.4 |
| Students w/disabilities | 50 | — | — | — | 2.4 |

Table E19d. Whately: In-School Suspension Rates by Student Group, 2022-2024

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | # included (2024) | 2022 (%) | 2023 (%) | 2024 (%) | State 2024 (%) |
| All | 127 | — | — | — | 1.4 |
| African American/Black | 1 | — | — | — | 2.1 |
| Asian | 0 | — | — | — | 0.3 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 6 | — | — | — | 1.9 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 2 | — | — | — | 1.6 |
| Native American | 0 | — | — | — | 1.8 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | 0 | — | — | — | 1.9 |
| White | 118 | — | — | — | 1.1 |
| High needs | 53 | — | — | — | 1.9 |
| Low income | 31 | — | — | — | 2.1 |
| English learners | 3 | — | — | — | 1.4 |
| Students w/disabilities | 31 | — | — | — | 2.4 |

Table E19e. Frontier: In-School Suspension Rates by Student Group, 2022-2024

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | # included (2024) | 2022 (%) | 2023 (%) | 2024 (%) | State 2024 (%) |
| All | 617 | — | 0.8 | 1.0 | 1.4 |
| African American/Black | 12 | — | — | — | 2.1 |
| Asian | 22 | — | — | — | 0.3 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 45 | — | — | — | 1.9 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 43 | — | — | — | 1.6 |
| Native American | 0 | — | — | — | 1.8 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | 0 | — | — | — | 1.9 |
| White | 495 | — | 0.8 | 1.0 | 1.1 |
| High needs | 235 | — | — | 0.9 | 1.9 |
| Low income | 174 | — | — | — | 2.1 |
| English learners | 4 | — | — | — | 1.4 |
| Students w/disabilities | 120 | — | — | 1.7 | 2.4 |

Table E20a. Conway: Out-of-School Suspension Rates by Student Group, 2022-2024

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | # included (2024) | 2022 (%) | 2023 (%) | 2024 (%) | State 2024 (%) |
| All | 149 | — | — | — | 2.4 |
| African American/Black | 0 | — | — | — | 4.6 |
| Asian | 0 | — | — | — | 0.6 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 6 | — | — | — | 3.8 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 6 | — | — | — | 2.6 |
| Native American | 0 | — | — | — | 3.5 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | 0 | — | — | — | 2.5 |
| White | 137 | — | — | — | 1.5 |
| High needs | 70 | — | — | — | 3.6 |
| Low income | 45 | — | — | — | 4.0 |
| English learners | 1 | — | — | — | 2.6 |
| Students w/disabilities | 40 | — | — | — | 4.5 |

Table E20b. Deerfield: Out-of-School Suspension Rates by Student Group, 2022-2024

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | # included (2024) | 2022 (%) | 2023 (%) | 2024 (%) | State 2024 (%) |
| All | 319 | — | — | — | 2.4 |
| African American/Black | 5 | — | — | — | 4.6 |
| Asian | 2 | — | — | — | 0.6 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 16 | — | — | — | 3.8 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 18 | — | — | — | 2.6 |
| Native American | 0 | — | — | — | 3.5 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | 0 | — | — | — | 2.5 |
| White | 278 | — | — | — | 1.5 |
| High needs | 135 | — | — | — | 3.6 |
| Low income | 82 | — | — | — | 4.0 |
| English learners | 4 | — | — | — | 2.6 |
| Students w/disabilities | 83 | — | — | — | 4.5 |

Table E20c. Sunderland: Out-of-School Suspension Rates by Student Group, 2022-2024

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | # included (2024) | 2022 (%) | 2023 (%) | 2024 (%) | State 2024 (%) |
| All | 190 | — | — | — | 2.4 |
| African American/Black | 6 | — | — | — | 4.6 |
| Asian | 18 | — | — | — | 0.6 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 25 | — | — | — | 3.8 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 15 | — | — | — | 2.6 |
| Native American | 0 | — | — | — | 3.5 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | 0 | — | — | — | 2.5 |
| White | 126 | — | — | — | 1.5 |
| High needs | 105 | — | — | — | 3.6 |
| Low income | 75 | — | — | — | 4.0 |
| English learners | 14 | — | — | — | 2.6 |
| Students w/disabilities | 50 | — | — | — | 4.5 |

Table E20d. Whately: Out-of-School Suspension Rates by Student Group, 2022-2024

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | # included (2024) | 2022 (%) | 2023 (%) | 2024 (%) | State 2024 (%) |
| All | 127 | — | — | — | 2.4 |
| African American/Black | 1 | — | — | — | 4.6 |
| Asian | 0 | — | — | — | 0.6 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 6 | — | — | — | 3.8 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 2 | — | — | — | 2.6 |
| Native American | 0 | — | — | — | 3.5 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | 0 | — | — | — | 2.5 |
| White | 118 | — | — | — | 1.5 |
| High needs | 53 | — | — | — | 3.6 |
| Low income | 31 | — | — | — | 4.0 |
| English learners | 3 | — | — | — | 2.6 |
| Students w/disabilities | 31 | — | — | — | 4.5 |

Table E20e. Frontier: Out-of-School Suspension Rates by Student Group, 2022-2024

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | # included (2024) | 2022 (%) | 2023 (%) | 2024 (%) | State 2024 (%) |
| All | 617 | — | 0.3 | 1.8 | 2.4 |
| African American/Black | 12 | — | — | — | 4.6 |
| Asian | 22 | — | — | — | 0.6 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 45 | — | — | — | 3.8 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 43 | — | — | — | 2.6 |
| Native American | 0 | — | — | — | 3.5 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | 0 | — | — | — | 2.5 |
| White | 495 | — | 0.4 | 1.8 | 1.5 |
| High needs | 235 | — | — | 3.4 | 3.6 |
| Low income | 174 | — | — | — | 4.0 |
| English learners | 4 | — | — | — | 2.6 |
| Students w/disabilities | 120 | — | — | 5.0 | 4.5 |

Table E21. Frontier: Advanced Coursework Completion Rates by Student Group, 2022-2024

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | # included (2024) | 2022 (%) | 2023 (%) | 2024 (%) | State 2024 (%) |
| All | 193 | 59.4 | 65.9 | 64.8 | 67.2 |
| African American/Black | 5 | — | — | — | 58.2 |
| Asian | 12 | — | 88.9 | 83.3 | 86.4 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 10 | 38.5 | 30.0 | 60.0 | 53.7 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic/Latino | 11 | — | 85.7 | 54.5 | 68.4 |
| Native American | — | — | — | — | 57.1 |
| Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | — | — | — | — | 59.8 |
| White | 155 | 62.2 | 67.5 | 64.5 | 71.9 |
| High needs | 67 | 33.3 | 39.6 | 53.7 | 52.0 |
| Low income | 52 | 40.8 | 44.4 | 59.6 | 53.1 |
| English learners | 1 | — | — | — | 31.8 |
| Students w/disabilities | 27 | 5.9 | 4.5 | 22.2 | 38.5 |

Table E22a. Conway: Accountability Results, 2024

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| School | Cumulative progress toward improvement targets (%) | Percentile | Overall classification | Reason for classification |
| Conway (district) | 38 | — | Not requiring assistance or intervention | Moderate progress toward targets |
| Conway Grammar | 38 | 58 | Not requiring assistance or intervention | Moderate progress toward targets |

Table E22b. Deerfield: Accountability Results, 2024

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| School | Cumulative progress toward improvement targets (%) | Percentile | Overall classification | Reason for classification |
| Deerfield (district) | 46 | — | Not requiring assistance or intervention | Moderate progress toward targets |
| Deerfield Elementary | 46 | 61 | Not requiring assistance or intervention | Moderate progress toward targets |

Table E22c. Sunderland: Accountability Results, 2024

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| School | Cumulative progress toward improvement targets (%) | Percentile | Overall classification | Reason for classification |
| Sunderland (district) | 58 | — | Not requiring assistance or intervention | Substantial progress toward targets |
| Sunderland Elementary | 53 | 46 | Not requiring assistance or intervention | Substantial progress toward targets |

Table E22d. Whately: Accountability Results, 2024

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| School | Cumulative progress toward improvement targets (%) | Percentile | Overall classification | Reason for classification |
| Whately (district) | 43 | — | Not requiring assistance or intervention | Moderate progress toward targets |
| Whately Elementary | 43 | 61 | Not requiring assistance or intervention | Substantial progress toward targets |

Table E22e. Frontier: Accountability Results, 2024

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| School | Cumulative progress toward improvement targets (%) | Percentile | Overall classification | Reason for classification |
| Frontier (district) | 34 | — | Not requiring assistance or intervention | Moderate progress toward targets |
| Frontier Regional | 35 | 61 | Not requiring assistance or intervention | Moderate progress toward targets |

1. For more information on the Teachstone CLASS protocol, visit <https://teachstone.com/class/>. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. DESE’s District Standards and Indicators are available at <https://www.doe.mass.edu/accountability/district-review/district-standards-indicators.docx>. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. Districts with similar demographics and similar wealth are based on [Resource Allocation and District Action Reports (RADAR)](https://www.doe.mass.edu/research/radar/) (retrieved February 2025). [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. CURATE: CUrriculum RAtings by TEachers. See <https://www.doe.mass.edu/instruction/curate>. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. When observers rate this dimension it is scored so that a low rating (indicating little or no evidence of a negative climate) is better than a high rating (indicating abundant evidence of a negative climate). To be consistent across all ratings, for the purposes of this report we have inversed this scoring. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
6. Column headings for Tables E1-E9: M/E = meeting or exceeding expectations; PME = partially meeting expectations; NM = not meeting expectations. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)